OF RESISTING THE Lawfull Magistrate *Under colour of* RELIGION,

AND

Appendant to it, of the word κρίμα, rendred *damnation*, *Rom.* 13.

REPRINTED.

ALSO,

Of the Zelots among the Jewes.
Of taking up the Crosse.
A vindication of Christs reprending S^t. *Peter*, from the exceptions of M^r. *Marshall.*

OXFORD,
Printed for *H. H.* and *VV. VV.* 1644.

1644?

? 1646

RESISTING

Of resisting the lawfull Magistrate upon colour of Religion.

IN this proposall of the point for debate, there are onely two words will need an account to be given of them: 1. What is meant by Resisting. 2. Why the word Colour is put in. For the first, Resisting, here signifies violent, forcible, offensive resistance, fighting against, as *Hesychius* the best Scripture-glossary explaines it, (ἀντιστρατεύόμενον & ἀνθιστάμενον all one, and ἀντιστάτης * ὁ ἀνθέτης ἐν τῇ μαχῇ) and the Apostle in like manner, *Rom.* 13. 2. using ἀντιτασσόμενος & ἀνθεστηκὼς, promiscuously for the same, and so in other places, although it is true, it is used sometimes in a wider sense; but that will not here be materiall, when we here set downe before-hand what we meane by it. For the second, the word [colour] is in the Title added, onely for this reason, (not to prejudge the Religion, which is fought for, to be onely a colour, but) because it is possible for a man to fight for Religion, and yet not upon colour of Religion, to wit, in case the Religion for which he fights be establisht by the Law of the Land, for then his colour for fighting may be the preservation of Law, which the Magistrate is bound by oath to maintaine, and though he fight for Religion, yet it is under that other colour: whereas he that fights upon colour of Religion making that his onely pretence of fighting, is *ipso facto* supposed to fight for a Religion distant or contrary to that which is established by Law, and so all pretence or colour of Law excluded, yea, and all supposition of failing in the Magistrate; he standing for the Law present, not against it; which I desire may be the setting of the case, to exclude the fallacy, *plurium interrogationum*,

* γρ. Ἀνθεστώς.

tionum, and to diſtinguiſh the quarrell of Religion from that other of Law, and ſo to meddle at this time onely with that which is fully within the Divines Spheare, and leave the other to ſome body elſe.

Thoſe two termes being thus explained, & ſo the ſtate of the queſtion ſet, the lawfull Magiſtrate, and the eſtabliſht Law of the Kingdome on one ſide; & ſome perſon or perſons inferiour to him, upon colour of Religion, *i. e.* for ſome Religion not yet eſtabliſhed by Law, on t'other ſide, that it ſhould be lawfull to them to take up armes againſt him, would ſeem not very reaſonable, if he were but a private man, abſtracted from Regall power, (which ſure doth not make it more lawfull to reſiſt him then any body elſe) having broken no eſtabliſhed Law, (as is ſuppoſed in the caſe) for what legall accuſation can lie againſt him in a point wherein he hath not broken the Law? But then this will be more unreaſonable, if moreover it be conſidered, that colour of Religion is ſo wide and unlimited a thing, that no man, that is never ſo much in the wrong in any opinion, but thinkes himſelfe in the right (for otherwiſe he would not continue in that errour) and ſo that colour will be plea equally good to all ſorts of errours, as well as truths: and beſides, he that hath not ſo much Religion as to be in an errour, may yet have ſo much wit as to make uſe of that Apology for his ſedition, (to wit, colour of Religion) & plead it as legally as the moſt zealous profeſſour; and conſequently, if that will ſerve turne, who ever ſhall but pretend to beleeve contrary to the Religion eſtabliſhed in any Kingdome, ſhall be *ipſo facto* abſolved from all bond of Allegiance in *foro humano*, and if he will adventure the hazard of the judgement to come, ſhall have no reſtraint layd on him by any earthly Tribunall; and ſo by this meanes already, the grounds of the diſſolution of any government are laid by this one unpoliticke principle, and the world given up to be ruled onely by the religion (which is in effect, the will) of every man; whereas before, there was a State as well as a Church, Policy as well as Religion, a power in the Magiſtrates hand, beſides that in every mans owne breſt or conſcience; and yet more particularly, a reſtraint for hypocrites, as well as any elſe, *i. e.* for pretenders of Religion, who, if this ground would hold, were left unlimited. Where, if it be interpoſed, that ſuch an one that fallaciouſly pretends Religion, though by this

this diſguiſe he eſcape here, yet ſhall ſurely pay for it hereafter; and that that is ſufficient, becauſe there is no other Court, but of that ſearcher of hearts, to which the hypocrite can be bound over; I anſwer, that although that be true, yet it is not ſufficient, becauſe, although there be a judgement to come for all crimes, yet it is notwithſtanding thought neceſſary to have preſent judicatures alſo, not to leave all offenders to terrours at ſuch a diſtance; and indeed for the continuance of the peace of Communities to provide ſome violent reſtraint at the preſent for thoſe, whom thoſe greater but future deterrements cannot ſufficiently worke on. This every man knowes is the originall of humane Lawes, yea, and of Dominion it ſelfe, a *præviſion* that all men will not doe their duties for love or feare of God, (it is apparent, the Jewes would not under their θεοκρατεια) and therefore for good mens ſakes, and for peace ſake, and for the maintaining of Communities, thoſe ſuperadditions have beene thought neceſſary, as ſome thornes in the hedge of Gods Law, that may pierce the hands and ſides of him that ſhall attempt to breake over or thorough it. From whence the concluſion will be evident, that the Rules for the preſerving of government muſt be ſuch as ſhall have force to reſtraine the Atheiſt or the Hypocrite, as well as the good Chriſtian (which ſure will leſſe need thoſe reſtraints) or elſe they are utterly unſufficient to the attaining of their end, *i. e.* to the preſerving of government, peace, community, or protecting any that lives under it: which being ſuppoſed, it will alſo follow, that nothing muſt be indulged upon any colour of Religion, (be his Religion never ſo true, and himſelfe never ſo ſincere in it;) which will open this gap or outlet to others, that may make the ill uſe of it. For this will be utterly deſtructive of the end of government (which is, that we may lead a peaceable and quiet life, 1 *Tim.* 2, 2.) yea, and of government it ſelfe.

This argument being thus proſecuted and cleared, might be ſufficient to determine this whole buſineſſe, were it not for one rejoynder which is ordinarily made, the force of which is taken from that ſupreme care that every man ought to have of his owne ſoule, and conſequently of the maintaining of his Religion on which (to abſtract from all poſſible diſputes concerning the particular truth of it, he being perhaps not acute or artiſt enough to uphold it againſt all objecters) he is fully convinc't, the health and ſalvation of that

wholly depends. For the maintaining of wch againſt all the humane power in the World, if he may not take up Armes or doe any thing, he cannot ſee what can be fit for him to fight for, (nothing ſure being more precious, then that;) or conſequently, why he may not take up that opinion of the Beyond-Sea Anabaptiſts, That it is not lawfull to fight at all: which if it ſhould be yeelded to, although for the preſent it would produce peace, yet it would be little for the advantage of Magiſtrates in the iſſue. To this I ſhall anſwer, by conceſſion of theſe foure things: 1. That Religion is to be every mans Supreme care, the prime Jewell in his Cabinet. 2. That it cannot, at leaſt in humane conſideration, be expected that any man ſhould be leſſe carefull of his falſe Religion (if he be really perſwaded of the truth of it) then any other is of the true. Nay, 3. that if he doe not uſe any lawfull meanes to defend that falſe (whilſt he is convinc't it is the true) Religion; this is a ſin of lukewarmneſſe in him, though indeed through prepoſſeſſion not to open his eyes to greater light and revelation of the truth offered to him, and perhaps through ſluggiſhneſſe not to ſeeke that light, be yet a farre greater ſinne in him. For though no man ought to defend the contrary to what he takes to be truth, yet ought he to be moſt ready to depoſite his errour, not onely when it doth, but alſo when it may appeare to him to be ſo, and to ſeeke to thoſe helpes that may be inſtrumentall to that end. 4. That in ſome caſes the uſe of Armes is not unlawfull. But then all this being thus granted, and ſo in effect, that all lawfull meanes may be uſed for the maintaining of Religion, we muſt yet ſecondly deny the inference of the Objection; upon this onely ground, becauſe though Armes may lawfully be uſed in ſome caſes, and Religion be maintained by all lawfull meanes; yet Armes are not a lawfull meanes for this end, and ſo may not be uſed in this caſe, that is by Subjects againſt the lawfull Magiſtrate in caſe of Religion, at leaſt when ſome other Religion is by Law eſtabliſhed in that Kingdome. Which aſſertion I ſhall confirme onely by foure Arguments: 1. Taken from the nature of Religion. 2. From examples of Chriſt and Chriſtians. 3. From the very making of Chriſtianity, and particularly of the Proteſtant doctrine. 4. From the Conſtitution of this Kingdome, which being ſubordinate to the other three may deſerve conſideration, as farre as it agrees with them.

1. Fro

1. From the nature of Religion, which is an act of the ſoule, which cannot be forced or conſtrained by outward violence, and therefore, 'tis apparent, needs no outward defence for the maintaining of it, much leſſe, invaſion of others. A man may be as truly religious under all the tyranny and ſlavery in the world, as in the moſt triumphant proſperous eſtate, They that have power to kill the body, are not able to commit the leaſt rape upon the ſoule; they may rob me of my life, they cannot of my Religion; the weakeſt creeple in the Hoſpitall may defie the whole Army of the Philiſtines in this matter. But you will aske, Is not the outward profeſſion and publike exerciſe of Religion ſome part of it, and that to be thus maintained, where any attempt to hinder it? To which I anſwer, That the firſt of theſe, the outward Profeſſion, can no more be hindred then the former act of the ſoule, but rather may be moſt illuſtrious in the time of depreſſion. I may confeſſe Chriſt in the den of lyons, in the furnace, on the rack, on the gridiron, and when my tongue is cut out, by patient, conſtant ſuffering in that cauſe. Religion is not ſo truly profeſſed by endeavouring to kill others, as by being killed patiently our ſelves rather then we will renounce it. When I fight, it may be malice, revenge, ſome hope of gaine (or impunity atleaſt) by the preſent ſervice, any one of a hundred worldly intereſts, that may helpe to whet my ſword for me, or moſt cleerly a hope I may kill and not be killed: and ſo all this while here is no act of confeſſion of Chriſt in thus venturing my life, although I doe affirme I doe this for my Religion; becauſe though I ſo affirme, men are not bound to beleeve me, there being ſo much oddes againſt me, that I doe it for ſome-what elſe. But when I lay downe my life patiently, the ſacrifice of my God, reſigne up all poſſible worldly intereſts for the retaining of my one ſpirituall truſt, this is to the eye of man a profeſſion capable of no reaſonable ſuſpicion of inſincerity; and indeed none ſo, but this.

As for the ſecond, the publike exerciſe of the true Religion, it were by all men heartily to be wiſht that it might be enjoyed at all times, for the advancing of Gods glory, increaſe of charity, converſion of others, &c. But if it may not be had by the uſe of lawfull meanes, it will not be required of us by God, without whoſe ſpeciall providence it is not, that he permitteth us to be forbidden that exerciſe. Till the ſame providence be pleaſed to remove ſuch hinderance

derance, and open to us a lawfull way of obtaining it: the primitive Christians secret meetings will first be imitable to us, and if those be obstructed also, their solitudes next. And however that designe of obtaining free exercise of our Religion, will never make any practice lawfull to be used in order to that, that before was utterly unlawfull.

But are we not to take care of our children and posterity, as well as of our selves? If our Religion be now suppreſt, our poore children and progeny to the end of the world may in all probability be kept in blindnesse and ignorance, and so left to the place of darkenesse irrecoverably. This objection sounds somewhat pathetically, and is apt to affect our bowels, more then our reason; moves our compassion first, and thorow those spectacles is then represented with improvement to our judgement. But for answer to it, though the doctrine of election of particular men, as well and as absolutely to the meanes as to the end, might be to him that acknowledges it, a sufficient amulet against this feare, and so no need of that their jealous care for their posterity, any farther then it is in their power to contribute toward them (which sure is no more then to doe what is lawfull for them to doe) yet the answer will be more satisfactory to all that acknowledge Gods providence, however opinionated concerning decrees, that whosoever considers himselfe as a man, much more as a father of a posterity, must have many things to trust God with, and onely God, and among those nothing more, then the future estate of those which are come from him. Yet if he be importunate and still unsatisfied, unlesse he himselfe contribute somewhat to the securing of his posterity in this matter, let me tell him there is nothing (after his prayers to God and paternall blessing on them) so likely to entaile his Religion upon them, as his sealing it by his sufferings. This sure will be a more probable way to recommend his Religion to them (when they shall heare and be assured by that testimony, that their fathers thus hoped in God) then that other so distant, that they died in a rebellion against the King, or that this Religion had beene in their time turned out of the land, had not they done something so unlawfull to protect it. Besides, the greatest prejudice which that posterity (of which we pretend such care) can suffer by my non-resistance, is onely to be brought up in a contrary Religion, to heare that way

first,

firſt, but ſure not to have their eares deafed againſt all others when they ſhall be repreſented, nor to bring the guilt of non-repreſentation upon them if they be not. And if I bring forth reaſonable creatures, I hope they will, by the grace of God, make uſe of their reaſon and his grace, to finde out that truth that their ſoules are ſo much concerned in; and if (through no default perſonall of theirs) they ſhould miſſe of it, I hope the invincibleneſſe of their ignorance, and their ſincere repentance for all their ſinnes and errours knowne and unknowne, and their readineſſe to receive the truth, if it were or might be repreſented to them, would be antidote ſufficient by Gods mercy in Chriſt to preſerve them from that poyſon, ſo they were carefull according to their meanes of knowledge to eſcape all other dangers. And all this upon ſuppoſition, but not conceſſion, that the Religion of him that would fight for it, were the truth and onely truth; whereas indeed there is not a more ſuſpicious marke of a falſe Religion, then that it is faine to propagate it ſelfe by violence; The Turkes and Papiſts being the onely notable examples hitherto of that practice, till ſome others, directly upon Popiſh principles a little varied in the application, have falne upon the ſame concluſion.

Now ſecondly for the examples of Chriſt and Chriſtians, but firſt of Chriſt: his example (as to this purpoſe) is evident in three paſſages (beſides that grand tranſcendent copy propoſed from the aggregate of all his life and death, *Matth.* 11. 29. *learne of me, for I am meeke and lowly.*) The firſt is, *Luk.* 9. 54. the inhabitants of a Samaritan village would not receive Chriſt, *verſ.* 53. upon that *James* and *John* remembring what *Elias* had done in the like kinde, 1 *King.* 18. and 2 *King.* 1. ask't his judgement of it, whether he would be pleaſed that they ſhould command fire to come downe from Heaven and conſume them; as *Elias* did, that is, in effect, whether they ſhould not doe well to uſe what ever power they had (and be confident that God would aſſiſt them in it) to the deſtroying of thoſe who ever they were (and yet that they were not their Magiſtrates it is cleer) which affronted them in the exerciſe of their Religion, or indeed which would not receive Chriſt. To this Chriſt anſwers ſternely, the words are emphaticall, he turned (as to *Peter* when he gave him that check, *Matth.* 16. 23.) and rebuked them, and ſaid, *Ye know not what manner of ſpirit you are*

Ἐν τῷ ζη-
λώσαι ζή-
λον νόμε
ἀπελήφθη.

are of: that is, *Elias* was a Zelot, 1 *Mac.* 2. 58. (the full importance of which will belong to another disquisition) & *jure zelotarum*, might doe somewhat against *Baals* prophets, which will not agree with that distant calling or profession of a disciple of Christ, or Christian, they are mistaken if they thinke they may doe as *Elias* did. From whence by the way is a prohibition fully legall put in against all examples of the old Testament (if any such there were) from being pleadable amongst Christians, upon this ground of *Josephus* his observing, that the Jewes were governed by a θεοκρατεια, God being as it were their King on earth for a long time, presiding immediately, and interposing by his Oracle, and other particular directions, as well as standing Law, as in that case of *Phinees* and *Elias*, &c. by which those acts of theirs, though authorized by no setled or ordinary Law, were yet as legall as whatever in any other Common-wealth were done by authority legally descending from the supreme Magistrate. Which whosoever shall now apply to Christians, besides, that he professes himselfe an asserter of Enthusiasmes, will meet with Christs check to the Boanerges, *You know not what spirit you are of*: I have not authorized you to pretend to the Spirit of *Elias*, or to doe what a Zelot among the Jewes might doe.

The second exemplary passage to this purpose in the story of Christ is, *Matth.* 26. 51. when Christ was apprehended by those tumultuous persons, at the best but servants of the chiefe Priests and Elders (not againe by any power of lawfull Magistrate) *Peter* drew the sword and smote off one of those servants eares; upon that, Christs Answer is the thing to be observed, *vers.* 52. then said Jesus unto him, *Put up again thy sword into his place, for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword*: The speech particular to *Peter*, a prime Disciple or Christian, that he having drawne the sword in defence of Christ, and in him of Christianity it selfe (a more justifiable course then ever any man since undertooke under the colour of Religion) must put it up againe; but the reason added of an unlimited universall obligingnesse to all Christians: *For all they that take the sword* (as *Peter* did, in defence of Christ, &c. or else the citation had not beene pertinent to him) *shall perish by the sword*. And the two parallel places which are noted in the margent of our English Bibles are somewhat considerable, the first

Gen.

Gen. 9. 6. where that Law was given to the ſonnes of *Noah*, עַל שְׁפִיכוּת דְּמִים concerning the effuſion of blood, which ſure was not any prohibition to legall, though capitall puniſhments of Malefactors (but rather the inveſting the Magiſtrate with that power of the ſword) and yet is by Chriſt urged as a prohibition to Saint *Peter*, ſignifying that effuſion of blood by him in that caſe to be utterly illegall, and againſt the intention of that old Law, not abrogated (it ſeemeth) by Chriſt. The other parallell place is, *Revel.* 13. 10. where immediately upon the repeating of thoſe words, *He that killeth with the ſword ſhall be killed with the ſword*, is ſubjoyned, *Here is the patience and faith of the Saints i.e.* Chriſtian Martyrs, *verſ.* 7. whoſe faith it ſeemes and patience muſt go together, which ſure is moſt irreconcileable with forcible reſiſtance.*

*Theſe are of this place of Christ to Saint *Pet.* I ſee M. M. hath labour'd to delude, and therefore I have labour'd to vindicate in another Diſcourſe hereto appendant, to which I referre the Reader.

The third exemplary paſſage of Chriſt was in his ſuffering, wherein many particular circumſtances might be obſerved, eſpecially his anſwer to *Pilate*, *John* 19. 11. in acknowledgement of his legall power given him from above. But all that I ſhall obſerve is onely in the generalll, That he that had ſo many legions of Angels, certainly ſufficient to defend him and invade his enemies (whatſoever will be thought of the Chriſtians ſtrength in *Tertullians* time to have done ſo too, of which more anon) did yet without the leaſt reſiſtance give himſelfe up to ſuffer death. And if it ſhould be objected, that this was to accompliſh what God hath decreed (*ought not Chriſt to ſuffer theſe things*, and *thus it is writen*, and *thus it behoved Chriſt to ſuffer*) and in obedience to that decree, not as matter of example to us, or of intimation, that it had not beene lawfull for him to have done otherwiſe. To this I anſwer, That as Chriſt was decreed to that death, and non-reſiſtance, ſo are Chriſtians (if Saint *Paul* may be beleeved) predeſtinated to be conformed to the image of his Sonne, *Rom.* 8. that is, to that patern of his in ſuffering, not fighting for Religion; and that revelation of Gods will in that decree being ſuppoſed, it will follow, That though Chriſt might have lawfully done otherwiſe, yet we Chriſtians now may not, eſpecially being commanded to learne of him particularly his meekneſſe; *i.* eſpecially that Lamb-like quality of the Lambe of God in his ſufferings, *Iſai.* 53. 7. So much for the examples of Chriſt.

Now for the like of Chriſtians, it will be needleſſe to mention

any other then those of whom *Tertullian* and Saint *Cyprian* speak, being so perfectly home to that purpose, *Tertul. in Apol. c.* 37. and his booke, *Ad Scapulam*, wholly to this purpose: and Saint *Cyprian* in his booke against *Demetrianum*, &c. the summe of which is this, That the Christians of that age had strength sufficient either to have resisted or avenged themselves upon their heathen persecuting Governours, but in obedience to the Lawes of Christ, chose rather to die, then doe so. The severall testimonies (of which this is the Abstract) being so fully produced by many, and knowne by all, it will be more to purpose to vindicate them from all exceptions, and intercept all evasions which the wit of this last yeare (beyond all that any former age pretended to) hath invented to evacuate those testimonies, witnesse *Goodwins Anticavalierisme*, p. 23. *&c.* and this I shall take leave to doe at large, because it is said, many have beene satisfied in the lawfulnesse of their present course by those Answers and Objections which that booke hath helpt them to.

1. It is objected, the *father* (Tertullian) *might easily be mistaken in making the estimate of the strength of Christians in comparison of the strength of them that were to oppose them.* This is in civill termes, to say *Tertullian* wrote he knew not what, or at the softest, he might be ignorant of what he affirmeth he knew, and I am confident was more likely to know, living then, then the Objecter now, seeing or conjecturing at the distance of so many hundred yeares, who hath not the least authority (which must be the Judge in matter of fact) on his side against so distinct and cleare affirmation, not onely of *Tertullian* in severall places (and that in an Apologie against the Gentiles, who could and would certainly have tript him in so manifest a falshood, if it had beene such; and though the negative Argument be not fully convincing, that they did not thus trip him, because we doe not heare or read they did, yet will this be of as much force as any he hath to the contrary: This certainly, the writing it to the Gentiles, will be able to conclude, that *Tertullian* had beene very imprudent and treacherous to his owne cause to have affirmed a thing in defence of it, which his adversaries could so manifestly have proved a falsity, if it were not so as he affirmed) but of *Cyprian* also, who lived about the same time, and no writer of that age or since produced (I doubt not but I may say, producible) to the contrary.

Of

Of the proofs that are offered to make it appeare possible and probable that *Tertullian* should be so mistaken, the first is, *Because this was no point of faith, &c. and therefore a devout father might fall under a misprision herein.* I grant he might, but that doth not prove he did, no nor that it is probable he should be a more incompetent judge in such a matter, then he that now undertakes to controll him: Nay sure, lesse reason is there to deny the authority of the ancients in matters of fact (which if they were not evident to them, must needs be much lesse evident to us, who have no meanes to know any thing of them but their relations, nor cause to suspect such relations, but either by some impossibility in the things themselves which is not here pretended, or by some other as authentick relation contradicting it, which is as little pretended) then of faith, the ground of which being onely the written word of God, is common with them to us, and therefore may enable us to judge whether that which they affirme to be matter of faith, be so indeed, to be found really in that sacred Writ from whence they pretend to fetch it.

And whereas it is farther added, *That no rule of charity or reason bindes us to beleeve another in any thing which belongs to the art or profession of another, and wherein himselfe is little versed or exercised.* I answer, that this saying thus applied will take away the authority of a very great part of those Histories which no body yet hath questioned. If it were spoken of Doctrines, it might hold, and sure to that belongs the axiome quoted, *Unicuique in arte suâ credendum est*; but in narrations it is the unreasonablest thing in the world to require the Narrator to be of that profession of which he relates the fact, for then no man must adventure to write a Kings life but a King; and if Mr. *M.* Mr. *A.* or Mr. *S.* being Ministers of the Word, shall write their letters concerning the Parliaments victory at *Keinton*, and relate the number of the slaine on that side so farre inferiour to those on the Kings, we must now upon this admonition retract that beliefe we then allowed them, and begin now (though too late) to question whether it were indeed a victory or no, which caused such solemne thanksgiving in this City. But then secondly, why this Relation should so wholly *belong to the profession of another*; *i. e.* not to *Tertullians*, I cannot yet discerne. For the maine of *Tertullians* testimony was, That the Christians chose

 rather

rather to suffer then to resist, though they were able, because Christian Religion taught the one, and forbad the other: and this sure was not without the sphere of the Divine: but for their strength to resist, depending on the number of Christians, not as even ballancing the Heathens in the Empire, but as very considerable and able to raise an Army, if they would make head, I doubt not but *Tertullian*, a Presbyter, that now laboured in converting and confirming Christians, and was not alwayes in his study, nay, who had lately beene a Lawyer, and so not unacquainted with the publike, might know and relate with farre better authority, then any who hath dared now to contradict him. For, for the art of *ballancing the power of parties in a Kingdome, and grounds of precise determination of such differences* (which as the Objecter denies *Tertullian*, so he is unwilling to yeild to the States-man himselfe) you shall see anon that we have no need to make *Tertullian* master of it, his relation will stand unmoved without it.

The second proofe to blast *Tertullians* relation, is the ordinary one in fashion now adayes, if any man differs in opinion from us, presently to examine his whole life, and if ever he did or spoke any thing unjustifiable, lay that vehemently to his charge, and by that defame him, and then we may spare the paines of answering his reasons, disproving his assertion, he once lied or sinned, and therefore it is ridiculous to expect any truth from him. The Argument is this, He might *mistake and miscarry* in this, for *not long after he miscarried so grievously, as to turne Montanist, who called himselfe the Holy Ghost, &c.* Just as if I should resolve to beleeve no relation of any Minister (present in either of the Armies) of the strength of that Army, untill I had examined, and were assured that he were not a Chiliast, an Arian, nor guilty of any others Heresie condemned by the Church: Yea and more, till I had some degree of assurance that he would never be such. Or as if I should resolve this man knew no Logick, because in this period he offends so much against Grammar in these words, [to turne Montanist, who called himselfe the Holy Ghost,] where the relative [who] hath certainly no antecedent, *Tertullian* cannot, for he called not himselfe the Holy Ghost (but onely used that stile so ordinary now adayes [*nos spirituales*] and all others [*animales psychici*,] and Montanist cannot, unlesse as once *Areopagi* signified the Areopa-

Smect.

gites,

gites, ſo now by way of compenſation, Montaniſt muſt paſſe for *Montanus*, for he it was that called himſelfe the Holy Ghoſt, not all or any of his followers. This way of concluding, from a ſlip in Grammar, an ignorance in Logick, (eſpecially being backt with the ſuffrage of ſo many unconcluding Arguments) will be as faire Logicall proceeding, as to inferre, becauſe *Tertullian* afterward turned Montaniſt, therefore then he ſpake he knew not what. But then Saint *Cyprian* was no Montaniſt, and yet he affirmed the ſame that *Tertullian* doth, *contra Demetrian*: As for the *approving of dreames and furious phantaſies for true propheſies* (which is added to be revenged on *Tertullian* for contradicting this Objecter) I confeſſe I excuſe not him, but wiſh we might learne any thing of him, rather then that. But I hope the narration we have now in hand was neither *Maximilla*'s nor *Priſca*'s *dreames*. If it was a *phantaſie*, it was quite contrary to a *furious* one. And for the cloſe of this Argument, wherein *the warning is given as it were from Heaven, how unſafe and dangerous it is to build on the authority of of men*, as I deſire the Reader may take it home with him, and from thence reſolve to beleeve no longer any thing upon this Objecters authority, ſo denudate of all reaſon, ſo I doe not yet ſee, why he that once erred, muſt never be allowed to ſpeake truth, the making of true narrations being compatible with the greateſt hereſie in the world.

The third Argument againſt *Tertullians* teſtimony, is an obſervation of *Selva*, that *there is a proneneſſe of inclination in much devotion in perſons devoutly given to over-value the workes and piety of other men*. To which my onely anſwer ſhall be, that yet I hope it is not obſerved that devout men are ſo ſtrongly inclined to tell plaine lies, to this end that they may make themſelves over-valued by others. This muſt be *Tertullians* infirmity (if the Objecter gueſſe aright) being a Chriſtian himſelfe, and in his Apology labouring to raiſe an high opinion of Chriſtians in the Gentiles to whom he writes, to which purpoſe if he ſhould forge falſities, I muſt confeſſe it were a ſhrewd weakeneſſe, very ill becoming devotion, whatever the practice of later times may ſay in excuſe of it.

The fourth proofe is from a ſecond obſervation, that in *the pious and orthodox Fathers themſelves there are ſome touches, and ſpeeches,*

ſome

ſome fibra of the root of bitterneſſe, which afterwards grew ranke in the times of Popery, &c. The Anſw. All that I can collect from hence toward the concluſion deſigned, is, that this objectors ſence is, that, for *Tertullian* to ſay there were Chriſtians enough in the Roman Empire to worke revenge on their oppreſſors, was a ſpice of Popery; and ſo there is one new piece of Popery more added, to the many which this age hath concluded under that title above the inventory of the *Trent* catechiſme. And ſo now to debate this any further, or profeſſe my ſelfe to opine as *Tertullian* did, is to acknowledge my ſelfe Popiſh, and that is as bad as Prælaticall: and ſo from henceforth all my arguments will but paſſe for temptations, which none but carnall men muſt ſubmit to, be they never ſo demonſtrative. Yet muſt I have leave to wonder how in the cloſe of this Section theſe words [*the ſounder and more conſiderate knowledge of theſe latter times*] can have any reference to the point in hand. For certainly, for the ſtrength of the then Chriſtian party, our knowledge in theſe latter times cannot be ſounder or more conſiderate, then theirs that then lived amongſt them; or if it be, the words [*latter times*] will be improper, for ſure it will be affirmed onely of that time wherein M^r. *J. G.* wrote this part of this booke; for I am confident he was the firſt that ever revealed this Act of more conſiderate knowledge to the world.

The fifth and laſt proofe is, That *whatever their number was, yet it is no wayes likely they ſhould be ſuffered to have any Armes, &c.* To which, and to all the prudentiall ſtate motives whereon it is grounded, (and ſo to all that Section) I ſhall returne no anſwer, but the very words of *Tertullian*, which if all put together, they doe not defend their author from all their aſſaults, neither will I beleeve the Chriſtians ſtrength was ſufficient to buckle with their adverſaries. His words are plaine: firſt, if we would *hoſtes exertos agere*, deale like profeſt enemies, *deſiſſet nobis vis numerorum & copiarum?* ſhould we have wanted force of numbers? (*i.* men) or armed ſouldiers (for ſo ſure *copiæ* ſignifies.) Secondly, he ſaith as plainly, *Caſtella veſtra, caſtra implevimus*, we have filled your Caſtles and Camps, (there, ſure they were armed; and ſo the Thebæan Legion, which yeelded themſelves to the Emperours butchery, wanted neither number nor Armes to have reſiſted.) Thirdly, he ſaith, *cui bello non idonei?* what warre had we not beene fit for? *etiam impares*

pares copiis though we had not had so many armed men as they) *qui tam libenter trucidamur.* Their despising of death, (nay, gladnesse to dye) might have put them upon any hazard unarmed, and he professes the onely thing that kept them from resisting, was the Doctrine which they had learnt, that it was more lawfull to be kild, then to kill. Fourthly, he saith, They had a way of revenge without Armes, to wit, by departing from them, by that secession to have brought envie upon them (as for example, upon dislike of the present state, to have gone to New England, &c. to raise an odium upon the Old) but this they would not be so malicious as to do neither: nay, besides *amissio tot civium ipsâ destitutione puniisset*, the losse of so many Citizens would have beene a punishment by makeing them lesse able to resist other enemies; *plures hostes, quàm cives usque remansissent*, there would have beene a greater number of enemies, then there would have beene Citizens remaining. Fifthly, to put all beyond exception, he puts them in minde how one night with a few firebrands they might have wrought their revenge, if it were lawfull for them to repay evill with evill. This one last particular being considered, is so full a demonstration of the truth now in debate, that supposing there were but one Christian at liberty to use that one firebrand, there can be no longer doubt but that there was sufficient strength to worke their revenge, if their Religion would have permitted them to do so. And if their Religion (as was said out of him) were the onely restraint, then certainly their weaknesse was not. Nay, though they should after all this (by a morally impossible supposition) be supposed weake, yet if their Religion did truly restraine them, as he professes it did, this were abundantly sufficient to decide the controversie betwixt us and the Objecter.

Having proceeded thus far in answer to the severall exceptions against the truth of *Tertullians* assertion concerning the strength of those Christians, I am invited farther by a second proffer of the Objecter to make appeare, that although *Tertullians* assertion should be supposed true, yet it were unsufficient, it would not reach the question, or case in hand. This certainly is strange at first sight, the case in hand being, Whether the reason of their non-resistance were their want of strength. Which in all reason must be determined negatively, when once these two things are supposed;

firſt, that they had ſtrength; ſecondly, that the command of Chriſt, or making of Chriſtianity was the cauſe of their non-reſiſtance, and not want of ſtrength. But there is no truth ſo evident, but the cunning of ſuch a crafts-maſter will be able to transforme, both from evidence and truth, and therefore (though in all juſtice a man might vow never to have commerce with ſuch a man more, that ſhould undertake thus to maſter his underſtanding, that he ſhould beleeve and not beleeve the ſame thing, yeeld the want of ſtrength to be the cauſe, at the very time when he acknowledges or ſuppoſes, firſt, no want of ſtrength; ſecondly, ſomewhat elſe, to wit, the command of Chriſt, to be the cauſe) yet I ſhall (to exerciſe that Chriſtian meekneſſe which I deſire to aſſert by my actions, as well as words) wait on this great Artificer to the ſecond part of his Anſwer. The ſumme of which, as he firſt ſets it, is this, that *ſuppoſing the Father ſpake truth* concerning their ſtrength, yet on ſome conſiderations he mentions, *It had beene in thoſe that were called to ſuffer both want of wiſdome in reſpect of themſelves, and of charity in reſpect of others, if they ſhould have made the leaſt reſiſtance.* To which my onely anſwer ſhall be to beſeech him to conſider, that this is part of *Tertullians* teſtimony, that the thing that reſtrained them was (not this wildeme but) the doctrine of their Chriſt; concluding it more lawfull to be kild, then to kill, and utterly unlawfull to repay evill for evill. And as for *charity* to *others*, I humbly wiſh that were, or may yet be conſidered, *how much burden, &c.* this reſiſtance (of which he is the profeſt abetter) hath brought on others who are no parties on either ſide, nor, I hope, ill Chriſtians, if their onely puniſhable crime be, making conſcience of non-reſiſtance.

To the next Section, in anſwer to a ſuppoſed reply, where he ſaith, *That it is not probable they had any ſufficiency of ſtrength.* I anſwer, that I cannot be ſo tame as thus to be caught, or ſo wild as to imagine that improbable, at a time when *Tertullians* teſtimony is ſuppoſed to be true (as now it is ſuppoſed) the ſpeciall part of which teſtimony is yeelded to be, that they had ſufficient ſtrength. And where he adds 2. that 'twas *not neceſſary they ſhould be of one mind and judgement touching this ſufficiency, &c.* I anſwer, that we doe not affert any ſuch neceſſity, nor doth our cauſe any way incline us to it, or want that refuge. For ſure we affirme not, that

they

they did actually reſiſt (to which onely, that concurrence would have beene neceſſary) but onely that they would not, though they were able, and to the evidenceing of that, the concurrence of judgement you ſpeake of, is not materiall, for if they that did ſo thinke of their ſtrength, were upon grounds of Chriſtian patience and obedience, as farre from doing or attempting it, as any other; theſe men would certainely have continued in the ſame obedience, though all the world had concurred with them in the opinion of their ſufficiency. For, to profeſſe Chriſtian meekneſſe firſt, and then upon any ſupervenient occurrence to be ready for reſiſtance, though it might be a character of the temporary (that I ſay not hypocriticall) ſubjection of our dayes, yet muſt not we be ſo groundleſly uncharitable as to affix it on thoſe Chriſtians; and though the Objecter ſhould renounce his preſent ſuppoſition, and againe contend, that *Tertullian* lied, and ſo diveſt him of all authority as a father, of common honeſty as a relater, yet ſure he will not be ſo ſevere to deny him ſo much of an ordinary *Rhetor*, as to make that an ingredient in his Apology for Chriſtians, which were the higheſt piece of an accuſation. Grant but *Tertullian* to have any skill in any of his profeſſions, ſuppoſe him but an Orator, if not a Divine, a tolerable pleader, if not a tolerable man, allow him but skill at the Deske, (his firſt Trade, before he was a Chriſtian) the reputation of a little eloquence, though no ſincerity, and his very pleadings will be argumentative, though his words may not.

But 'tis added in the third place, *that having no invitation, countenance, or command from any authority, &c. their caſe was differing from ours.* To which I anſwer againe, 1. That it was not ſtill the want of ſuch command or invitation, that reſtrained them, but the contrary command of Chriſt, as hath beene cleare; but then ſecondly, I pray let me aske a queſtion as of one which I will in reaſon ſuppoſe not to be unacquainted with the lence of *Junius Brutus*, and *Buchanan*, and it is onely this, whether, if all temporall Magiſtrates neglect the worke of Reformation, the Miniſters may not and ought not to attempt it, if they can hope to prevaile? If ſo then though the caſe be not juſt the ſame now and then, yet the difference is not materiall or pertinent, for then ſure Miniſters there would have beene to invite, if that had beene the Chriſtian way.

But when it is added within three lines, that we are *invited*, &c. *by as great and as lawfull an authority as this State hath any.* I muſt confeſſe I had thought that the King and both Houſes had beene a greater authority; unleſſe the meaning be not ſimply, but *ad hoc*, as great and as lawfull an authority as this State hath any, to doe what is now done, and then ſure it ſhall be granted by me, who profeſſe my ſelfe to ſuppoſe it impoſſible that any command given to this purpoſe ſhould be lawfull, or able to ſecure any from that ſentence of Saint *Pauls, They that reſiſt ſhall receive to themſelves damnation.* Yet once more, it is poſſible that the Author, by *this State* may meane a Republique, which though it be a word of ſome ſignification in ſome other Countries, yet that our Lawes acknowledge any ſuch here, I have not yet beene taught, nor ſure can any part of this Kingdome without the King, be capable of this Title, till we have moulded a new forme of Government, and new Lawes, as the Modell of that; for undoubtedly the old ones are not acquainted with any ſuch. But that I will hope is not the meaning, becauſe it is added that *inferiour Magiſtrates*, &c. which ſeemeth to acknowledge that the Parliament without the King are but inferiour Magiſtrates. Of the agreeableneſſe of that Title of *Magiſtrates and Rulers*, to that body without the head, I purpoſe not to ſpeake; onely to that which is added, that they *ſhould be obeyed, as well as Kings*, I anſwer, (without canvaſing of the place in Saint *Peter*, which others have done) that if they are *to be obeyed*, but *as well as Kings*, then, 1. The King that commands not to doe it, is to be obeyed, as well as they. 2. Not they againſt the King, for that the inferiority implies. An inferiour Magiſtrate, in that that is lawfull, and within his Commiſſion, and not thwarted by a ſuperiour, is to be obeyed as well as if he were ſuperiour in that, or as well as the ſuperiour in any thing elſe; but ſure not to the deſpiſing of the ſuperiours lawfull commands, when they doe interpoſe, for that were more then *as well*. When the King commands that which God and the Law doth not forbid, it may be ſaid, that his commands are to be obeyed as well as Gods, which the Apoſtle intimates, when he ſaith, *you muſt be ſubject for conſcience ſake*; and the ground of this truth is, becauſe indeed God the ſupreame, commands that ſubjection to the King in ſuch matters. But ſure for all this the King is not to be obeyed againſt God,

or

or where any countermand of his hath intervened, for this were in Saint *Peters* phraſe *to obey men* (not as well, but) rather then God. Thus is it in that other caſe, the inferiour is to be obeyed, *as well as the ſuperiour* (in things lawfull and not contradictory to the Superiours commands) upon that ground of neceſſity of obedience to the Superiour, from whom he hath his Commiſſion, and as S. *Peter* ſaith, ὡς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ πεμπόμενοι, *is ſent of him, i. e.* of, or by that ὑπέρεχον, ſupereminent perſon, the King; but ſure this holds not againſt the ſuperiour, as in the other caſe it did not. 3. Not they when they command to take up Armes againſt him whom Saint *Paul* bids me not reſiſt upon paine of damnation, and by my oath of Allegiance (if it were otherwiſe lawfull) I have bound my ſelfe that I will not. Whereupon it is obſervable, that the aſſertors of this warre, are now brought to undertake, that damnation, or κρίμα, *Rom.* 13. ſhall not ſignifie damnation (poore men, what a weake thred doth the Sword hang in, that is juſt over their ſoules? and what a ſad condition would it be, if to one that dyes a confident Martyr in this warre, damnation at the day of doome ſhould prove to ſignifie damnation?) but ſome temporary mulct; and yet withall that this warre is not againſt the King (when yet that other againſt the Earle of *Eſſex* his Army, is not doubted to be againſt the Parliament) which two ſo ſtrange, and yet diſtant holds (for if it be not againſt the King, what need of that other evaſion from the damnation, that belongs to reſiſters, or if reſiſters ſhall carry it away ſo eaſily, why may not Warre be avowed againſt the King, by any that will adventure his wrath?) doe ſure ſignifie mens conſciences to be ſtrangely grounded, and themſelves very groundleſly confident, which are ſatisfied upon no better principles, and whoſe practices are capable of no better ſecurity.

Upon theſe grounds thus laid, of obedience due to inferiour, as well as ſuperiour (ſupreme it ſhould be, for ſo ὑπέρεχων muſt here ſignifie, and I hope that our King amongſt us is ſuch) Magiſtrates, the objecter *puts a caſe, that the inferiour Governour requires that which is onely honeſt, &c. as to do our beſt to defend our ſelves againſt thoſe that contrary to law and conſcience aſſault us, the ſuperiour that which is contrary to both*, viz. *to ſit ſtill, &c.* In this caſe he reſolves it is moſt cleare on his ſide, for (whether the lawfulneſſe or ne-

ceſſity he intimates not of) *reſiſtance againſt the ſuperiour.* To this I anſwer, that it is hard to beleeve that the objecter did not purpoſely intend to deceive his Reader by that phraſe [*onely honeſt, &c.*] For that is a very doubtfull ſence, it may ſignifie, that nothing elſe were honeſt, and then it is in that ſence apparently falſe, for if it were honeſt to take up Armes againſt a King, yet ſure may not-taking-up Armes be honeſt too, for (whatever that crime of neutrality ſignifie in theſe daies) it may be lawfull for a man to ſuffer injury, to ſuffer himſelfe to be defrauded (and that by a King, as well as by an equall) 1 *Cor.* 6. 7. I hope reſiſtance, though it have lately commenced, and taken upon it the degree of vertue, yet hath not turned Projector, got the monopolie of vertue and honeſty into its hand, that it ſhould engroſſe and encloſe that title, and there be no other vertue or honeſty beſides this; yet would the affirmations of ſome out of no meaner place then the Pulpit, [that all that are for the King at this time are Atheiſts or Papiſts] conclude and perſwade thus much. But I would faine beleeve that the meaning of the phraſe [*onely honeſt, &c.*] is, [no more then honeſt] *i.e.* not neceſſary. But if that be it, then ſure the ſuperiour Governour may deſerve to be obeyed in forbidding it, as well as the inferiour in commanding: For it will not follow in that caſe, that the King *commands* ſomewhat contrary *to the Law of God, and nature,* but onely ſomewhat contrary to ſomething which was agreeable, *i.e.* not againſt the Law of God and nature, *i.e.* prohibits a thing lawfull, not neceſſary, as the other is ſuppoſed to command a thing lawfull, not neceſſary: which ſure were as free for him to do, as for the inferiour, ſuppoſing, as the objecter ſuppoſes, *that the command of God indifferently extends it for obedience to either, in things that are lawfull.* Hence it appeares that in the caſe here put, the command of the Superiour is falſely affirmed, to be an unlawfull command (for then the matter of the inferiours command muſt be ſuppoſed, not *onely honeſt*, but neceſſary) and if it be a lawfull one, it may and will then make void that obligation for that particular, which is ſuppoſed by the Law of God to lye on us, to obey the inferiour in that which is lawfull. The ſhort is, if that which is here ſpoken of, be in it ſelfe neceſſary, we muſt do it, as in ſpight of all countermands of the ſuperiour, ſo without all commands or invitations of the inferiour Magiſtrate; but if it be not neceſſary in it

ſelfe,

ſelfe, neither will the commands of an inferiour make it neceſſary to any who ſtands prohibited by a ſuperiour.

In the fourth Section the Objecter offers as a reaſon, why thoſe ancient Chriſtians (ſuppoſing ſtrength in them) ſhould *rather patiently ſuffer*, becauſe before their converſion *they had conſented to the Emperour's power, whereby thoſe Edicts were made for the murthering of Chriſtians, &c.* To which I anſwer, that it is ridiculous to ſeeke out or impoſe upon the Reader probable or poſſible reaſons for their non-reſiſtance, when *Tertullian* in their name ſpecifies the true onely reaſon, the Goſpell doctrine of Chriſtian patience and obedience. But for the particular of their conſent, much might be added, to ſhew the vanity of that plea, if that were *tanti*, or pertinent. I ſhall onely ſay, that if the Emperour legally murthered *Chriſtians*, then their conſent to that Law (or to the power of the Emperour who made it) would not bind or diſpenſe with them to omit any thing neceſſary or otherwiſe commanded by any greater power; for if I ſweare to doe ſo, I muſt breake my oath, *non obſtante* what is concluded from, *Pſal.* 15. 4. And if it were not otherwiſe neceſſary or commanded by greater power, then neither is reſiſtance now. And then the Kings prohibition will as much reſtraine me in any thing not neceſſary, as their heathenish conſent could be ſuppoſed to reſtraine them then. Nay, he that makes that *conſent a nullity* (as this Objecter in fine doth) what reaſon can he render why he that gave that conſent, might not plead that nullity, for ſuch (though carnall) advantages as life is, if he could make good his pleading, and no other reſtraint lie on him, but onely that null-conſent?

For the fifth Section, How that may be lawfull [for an entire body to doe, which may not be lawfull for a part] and ſo for us now, though not for them; I anſwer, That if the phraſe [entire body] ſignifie the head and members too, then the period is true; if not, then the whole Section is fallacious: for it followes not, that though the repreſentative body without the head is more, then a party in the Empire, without the repreſentation of the reſt, therefore the firſt may reſiſt forcibly, though the ſecond ſhould not: for he that from Saint *Paul* denies reſiſtance of Subjects indefinitely to Kings, will not be moved from that hold, by diſcerning ſome other ſlight differences betweene Subjects, unleſſe they

may,

may appeare such that on one side they may authorize resistance. But then secondly, If the Doctrine of Christian patience, &c. were the cause of Non-resistance, then sure was not this other consideration wherein they differ from us, the cause of it.

Well, having gone thus farre, in attendance on this Objecter, and to exercise that patience, which we so much desire to perswade: there is yet the greatest fort behinde unvanquished, erected in the sixth Section, and rescued from all supposed assailants in six particulars following, set up like so many fortresses about it. The summe of it is (for I would not be bound to recite what every one may read in a printed Book) that if *those Primitive Christians had strength, and might lawfully have resisted,* (by the way *Tertullian* onely affirmes the first, and is so farre from supposing, that he absolutely denies the second) yet might *God hide this liberty from them*; and so his *after dispensations did require that he should hide it from them, and yet manifest it to us: and these dispensations he specifies to be Gods counsell of Antichrists coming into the world then, and of his being destroyed, and cast out now.* The *hiding of this truth* of subjects power and right to resist their Superiours, *being necessary to helpe Antichrist up to his throne.* And the *commonalty of Christians doing contrary to the will of their Superiours, being the men that must have the principall hand in executing Gods judgements upon the Whore, Revel.* 18. 4, 5, 6, & 9. that is, in the pulling him downe.

To this whole Discourse (the first I am confident that ever was written on this Subject) I must answer by degrees, (that I may not omit any thing that is added for proofe or explication by the Authour) and first, I must desire the word *may or might* [may hide] may be changed into plaine intelligible sense. Say, did God hide the liberty of resistance from those Primitive Christians, or no? If he did not, then away with this whole Section, and particularly that affirmation, Pag. 30. that Gods dispensations did require that it should be hid from them: but if God did indeed hide it; then first, this is more then a supposition, it is a plaine concession that those Christians *Tertullian* speakes of, might not lawfully have resisted, though they had had strength (which was so long denied) for the light being hidden, they must have done it without faith, or against conscience, yea, and against Gods determinate

minate counsell, who, (the Objecter saith) had great causes to hide it, of which one sure must be, that it should not be used. 2. Here is a great secret of new Divinity, that God hides truths (not as Christ spake in parables, because they seeing see not, *Matth.* 13. 13. but) on purpose to helpe Antichrist to his throne. (of which more anon.) As for that instance of those *that eate herbs*, I pray consider, whether that be pertinent to prove that God purposely hides truths from us, or particularly this truth in hand. For sure that liberty God hid from none in the Apostles time; for the preaching of the Gospell manifested the lawfulnesse of meats, as well as herbs, onely some saw not, or considered not, that that was manifested, and thinking some old legall obligation (as others did circumcision) to lie still on them, submitted to it out of piety. Now apply this to the point in hand. Certainly the liberty of forcible resistance against Superiours (though it should be granted) would never be found of this kind, a liberty brought into the world by Christ, which before had not beene there. If he shall affirme it was, (as he must if that instance of eating be pertinent) though by the confession of the latter part, he must disclaime all his former old-Testament pleas for resistance, from the people about *Jonathan*, from *David*, and from *Elisha*; yet will he never give any probable appearance for the affirmation in the first part, that Christ gave any such new before-unrevealed liberty: but rather, if any such liberty before there were, it was undoubtedly taken away by Christ, from whose example and precepts it was that those Primitive Christians, and we also, dare not make use of that supposed liberty. The onely thing I can imagine possible to be replyed, is, that though the comparison hold not exactly, yet it may hold in this, that as that liberty of eating was hid to some (it matters not by whom, or how) so this of resisting to others. To which I returne, that then it is confest, that this instance doth onely illustrate the Objecters meaning, but not so much as probably confirme his assertion: and then I am sorry I have considered it so long, and therefore to bring the point to an issue, I must thirdly aske, Where this liberty, or the authority for this liberty was, when it was thus hid. Was it in the old Testament? Though it should be there, as it is not, yet it might be taken away in the New, (as those things which in the old Testament, or the law of nature,

are neereſt to giving of that liberty, are abſolutely reformed by Chriſts Doctrine and practice) and then that were good for nothing. Was it in the new? Then deale plainly, ſhew the place in the new Teſtament which gives that liberty, and is now found out by poſterity, though hidden to them. Sure we have found out no new Scripture, to them unknowne (the Nazarites Goſpell though it rehearſe ſome ſpeeches of Chriſt not in our Canon, yet is not produced for any of this nature: that famous one which it fathers on our Saviour, *Nunquam lætatus niſi cum fratrem in charitate videritis*, is of another ſtampe, I would to God this Apocryphall Precept might be Canonicall among us) and for any place of the knowne Canon miſ-underſtood by them, and now clearly unclouded and revealed to us in a right underſtanding, which inforces this, I muſt be ſo charitable to the Objecter, as to thinke that if he had diſcerned any ſuch, he would not have failed to have ſhewed it us, (as well as his interpretations of *Rom.* 13. and *Revel.* 17. 17.) if it were but to leave us unexcuſable for not being his Proſelytes. Beyond theſe ſeverall wayes of revelation, if poſterity have had any other (or indeed any but that of underſtanding of Scripture, by Scripture light, or aſſiſtance of Gods Spirit, which was not before underſtood) from whence to fetch a liberty which is not in the old Bible, or is denied in the New, this is it which we deſire ſo to warne men of under the name of Enthuſiaſme, which is hardly ever diſtinguiſhable from a demure frenſie, and I muſt call it now the dreame of the dreamers, *Jude* 8. that deſpiſe dominion, ſpeake evill of dignities, but farre from divine revelation. And yet that this is the thing that this Objecter hath an eye to, (and not the underſtanding of Scripture more clearly, then before) may appeare, in that he affirmes this truth *hid from their teachers*, (though *not from all without exception*) who yet if it were hid in the Scripture, were of all others moſt unlikely not to finde it. As for that offer of proofe, that this truth might lie hid, becauſe there was *no occaſion of ſtudying it*: I anſwer, that in *Tertullians* dayes when there was occaſion to ſtudy it, (as great as ever can ariſe any, becauſe the perſecutions then, were as heavie perſecutions) we may by that argument thinke they would have ſearcht into it, at leaſt the light then would not in ordinary account have proved more dim, as he ſaith it did, if the Scripture were the

candleſtick

candlestick where this light was held out. That which he adds in the next place, *of the spirit of courage, patience, and constancie, which was by God powred out on the Church in those dayes, and so made martyrdome seeme a desirable thing to them*, is more like a reason indeed of their not inquiring into this liberty: and herein, I must acknowledge the ingenuity of the Objecter, or the power of truth which extorted this reason from him, so little to the advantage of his cause, and so much of ours. For this is certainly the bottome of the businesse, the want of Christian courage, patience, &c. (for that kinde of courage is not in fighting, but suffering) hath helpt us of this last age to that [dreame, not] revelation of liberty, which was never heard of among the ancients. But by the way, it seems by the Objecter that now martyrdome is no desirable thing, nor taking up Christs Crosse, nor following of him. We are resolved to have no more to doe with martyrdome, thinke that the thousand years for the Saints to reigne on earth are now at hand, and so suffering, or conformity to the image of Christ, no longer the thing we are predestin'd to, we must set up a new trade of fighting, destroying, resisting, rebelling, leave enduring to those *Christians which were furnished with extraordinary strength from Heaven.* Which are the Objecters words of the Primitive Christians, which, saith he, kept them from studying cases and questions about lawfulnesse of escaping, (which word meere shame hath put in, utterly impertinently, instead of resisting) I confesse, I had thought our Queen *Mary* Martyr, had had this strength from Heaven too; and that it was not like miracles, an extraordinary gift onely for the infancie of the Church: but now it seemes we must expect to see no more Martyrs, till we can remove mountains againe: This Objecter, it is cleare, is resolved against it at this time, and that his actions, as well as writings, will be ready to testifie. For my owne part, I trust I shall be as ready to oppose the one, as I am to confute the other, and to thinke nothing more Christian still, then to be crucified with my Christ, and if I might chuse the Article of Christian Doctrine which I should most desire to seale with my bloud, I thinke it would be that of meeknesse, patience, non-resistance, peaceablenesse, charity, which I conceive Christ hath beene so passionately earnest to recommend unto me, as most diametrically opposite to

the most unchristian damning sinns of pride, ambition, malice, rebellion, unquietnesse, uncontentednesse, &c.

Fourthly, for the whole discourse about Antichrist, there must many things be returned. 1. That it is not tolerable in a Christian to affirme, that God purposely hid truths, that Antichrist might come into the world; this so harsh sence the Objecter first disguises in another phrase, that God *by speciall dispensation suffered him to make many truths his footstoole*, but indeed that reaches not home to the businesse undertaken to be proved, for it followes not thence, that this of resisting superiours was one of those truths, if it were, then God suffered him to make use of it, which he could not but by its being made knowne, whereas he supposes it was then hid; If he meane Antichrist hid it, and so made the holding it, his footstoole. Then 1. it was not God that hid it, as before he said, but Antichrist. 2. It had then beene manifest before, and then began to be hid, when there was most occasion to use it, which before he made improbable. If I were put upon the racke I could not give a rationall account of those words of the Objecter last recited, or such as may but be consonant to his present undertakings: that which followes is more cleare, that *God caused a dead sleep to fall upon those truths*: If he did, I wonder who first raised them out of that dead sleep, *Junius Brutus*, or *Buchan.* or Mr *Goodwin?* but still it seemes God did on purpose hide truths in favour and assistance to Antichrist to helpe him into the world, and this, not like the Spirit of slumber sent on men for their punishment, but on divine truths which sure had not deserved it; Yet more particularly that the doctrine of liberty to resist superiours should be *so opposite in a speciall manner to Antichrist*, that it was faine to be laid asleepe to give him passage into his throne, seemeth very strange to me. 1. Because one piece of Antichrists pride is to exalt himselfe above all that is called God, which is mostly interpreted Kings, and if rightly, then they that do so enhaunce the power of the people; as to make the King *universis minorem*, and loose the rains of obedience so farre as to permit resistance: will I feare discerne some part of the marke of the Beast upon their owne brests. 2. Because the ὁ κατέχων, 2 *Thes.* 2. 6. and ὁ κατέχων, vers. 7. that hindred, or let Antichrist, and was like to doe so still, till he were taken out of the way, was by the

Fathers

Fathers commonly resolved to be the Roman Empire or Imperiall Soveraignty of *Rome*, see *Tert. De resurr. c. 24. Ambr. tom. in 2. Thes. Hier. qu. 11. ad Algas: Chrys. in 2. Thes. Cyr. Hier. catech. 11. Aug. de civ. Dei, l. 20. c. 19. Lact. l. 7. c. 25. Oecum. in loc. & ib. Sever. & Gen.* and therefore on the sacking of *Rome* by *Alaricus* the Goth, S. *Jerome* presently expected that Antichrist should come, and in his book *ad Ageruchiam de monogam.* wonders that any one would thinke of marrying at that time; Hence, have learned men observed, was that custome in the most ancient times to pray in their Lyturgies for the lasting of the Roman Empire, that so Antichrist might be long a coming, *Tert. Apol. c. 39. ad. Scap. c. 2.* From whence though nothing else can be demonstratively inferred, yet this certainely may: that in those many Fathers opinion the power of Kings continuing intire, was not like to helpe Antichrist in, nor consequently the bringing downe that power by the revelation of the doctrine of resistance, like *to cause an abortion in Antichrists birth*, or now tend to the casting him out of the world.

As for the evidence of that Revelation-rule that the commonalty in opposition to their Kings, must have the great stroke in executing Gods judgement on Antichrist, proved, *Revel.* 18. 4. 6. 9. I must answer, 5. That I shall never wonder enough at the power of Prejudice evidenced in this Objecter, by what he hath put together to this purpose, pag. 32. To prove that the people contrary to their Kings shall destroy Antichrist, this is thought by him sufficient evidence, that *the people are commanded to go out of her*, vers. 4. when vers. 9. it followes that the *Kings of the earth shall bewaile her, and lament for her*: The unconcludingnesse of the argument I shall not insist on, but onely looke forward to another place which he cites immediately, *Revel.* 17. 17. *Where the ten Kings are said to hate the Whore, and make her desolate.* Now the word Kings in this last place signifies, saith the Objecter, not the persons of Kings but their states and Kingdomes, and to this purpose proofes are produced, but 1. I beseech him to deale ingenuously: doth the word King ever signifie the kingdome opposed to the King, 1. Any part of the Kingdome excluding the King; but then 2. See the mystery of prejudice which I mentioned, where it is for the Objecters turne;

Revel. 18. The Kings of the earth must signifie their persons in opposition to their people, but where it is not for his turne, *Revel.* 17. There the word Kings, must signifie the people, or any but the King: Would not the spirit of meeknesse have easily compounded this businesse, and have given the word (Kings) leave in both places, to signifie both their persons and their Realmes, and so have reconciled the places, that some Kings with their Kingdomes should bewaile her, and some against hate her, they bewaile her, that continued with her till her destruction, when they see the smoak of her burning, 18. 9. and others hate her who had once rusted of her filthinesse, and repented and left her before; this were very agreeable to those texts, if we had not peremptorily resolved to fetch some other sence out of them. 3. That first place alone by it selfe concludes onely thus much, that good men come (or are exhorted to come) out from Antichrist, and avenge the whore, and earthly men that have love to her, bewaile her, but not that either the first are all common people (for sure Kings may be called Gods people, or be in that number) or the second none but Kings; As for the proofe that those people, vers. 4. are the subjects of those kings, vers. 9. Because they are such as come out of *Babylon*, sure that is very weake, for *Babylon* being the Province of the Whore, there may be kings as well as subjects there, and those Kings come out too, as well as those subjects. For suppose King and people of *England* all Popish, why might they not all reforme together? It seemes Antichrist must never be cast out of a Kingdome till the people doe it in spight of the King, and therefore it is concluded that it was not done here in the dayes of King *Edward*, nor Queen *Elizabeth*, nor King *James*, and now since the new Revelations have assured men that Antichrist must now be cast out utterly from among us, it is become necessary that our Soveraigne should be a Papist, and as much zeale and as solid arguments used to perswade our friends that indeed he is so, (though his constant word and actions now evidence the contrary) as are produced to maintaine any other article of our new Saints beliefe: one of the most suspected and hated heresies of these dayes, is to doubt of the Popish affections of our Superiours, especially the King: Well by this doctrine, if the King should chance not to be a Papist, he must turne to be one, or else

Popery

Popery cannot be cast out in his time. If so he should doe, turne Papist on purpose to prepare, or dispose his Kingdome to turne Antichrist out, this might be but answerable to Gods hiding of truths to that end to helpe Antichrist in. But should his Majesty be so malicious as to prove Protestant in earnest, then what would become of that sure word of Prophecy that so many have beene perswaded to depend on, that Antichrist must now be cast out of this Kingdome, which saith the Objecter cannot be, unlesse the people doe it while the King bewailes. I hope I have said enough of this.

As for the connexion of this observation, with the conclusion in hand (though it matter little now, the observation is proved so false, yet) I shall adde, that if the people were to doe that great feat of casting out Antichrist, yet it appeares not how liberty of forcible resisting their Kings should be a necessary requisite to the worke, unlesse the lawfull King be the Antichrist in every country; for otherwise it is very possible that though they obey their Kings they may resist Antichrist, though they love and revere their lawfull Superiour, they may hate and abjure their unlawfull: Once more, whereas it is againe repeated, that the *knowledge of the supposed subjects liberty would have kept Antichrist from his throne*, I repeat againe, that if it would, God sure would have revealed it to them of all others, unlesse it appeare, that God was more angry with the sinnes of Christians in *Tertullians* age, and so more fought against them, then he doth in ours against us, for though God may of mercy undeserved throw downe Antichrist, yet that he should so immediately and illustriously labour to set him up, unlesse out of deserved indignation to a people, is not easily resolved; yet if this may appeare *de facto* to be so, I shall yeeld; till then, it is not.

The last blot laid on *Tertullian* to obliterate all whatsoever can be fetcht from him is, that *the authority of* Tertullian, *and the submission of the Christians being both Apocryphall, it is unlike to weigh against the practice of the great Prophet* Elisha, *&c.* To which I answer, that that being supposed, yet the grounds on which *Tertullian* saith the Christians of his time did so patiently suffer, viz. the doctrine of Christian patience and meeknesse, are not Apocryphall, nor inferiour to that of *Elisha*, though it were supposed no

be

be argumentative, or concluding for reſiſtance. For any thing elſe added by the Objecter in this buſineſſe as the diſproving of *Tertullians* relations on grounds of Chriſtian doctrine, from the contrary practice of *David* and *Eliſha*, though I might anſwer in one word, that Chriſtians are reſtrained from ſome things which were practiced without fault in the old Teſt. yet becauſe thoſe old-Teſtament examples have been fully cleared by many others of our writers, and indeed are not pertinent to the diſcourſe I was upon, when this Objecter firſt met me in the way, and led me this chace after him, I ſhall not be ſo impertinent as to adde any thing, but conceive my ſelfe to have vindicated the teſtimonies of thoſe Fathers from all poſſible objections, and ſo to have joyned the practiſe of Chriſtians, (thoſe ancient primitive ones) and proved them correſpondent to the example of Chriſt, and ſo to have made good my ſecond argument propoſed from the example of Chriſt and Chriſtians.

My third is, from the very making of Chriſtianity, and particularly of the Proteſtant Doctrine. And 1. Of Chriſtianity, which as it differs from the Lawes both of *Moſes* and Nature, ſo it conſtantly reformes and perfects thoſe (diſſolves not any thing that was morall in them, nor promiſes impunity for non-performance, but upon repentance & reformation) elevates & raiſes them up to an higher pitch, at leaſt then Jewes or naturall men had conceived or underſtood themſelves obliged to, which the ancient Fathers generally reſolve to be the meaning of his ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι, *Mat.* 5. 17. to fill up all vacuities in thoſe former Lawes, and adde unto thē that perfection which ſhould be proportionable to that greater meaſure of grace now afforded under the Goſpell. Thus in that Sermon upon the mount, that ἄκρον ἠθικῆς καὶ φιλοσοφίας, that top of practicall Divinity, (ſet downe by way of particular inſtance of Chriſts purpoſe, οὐ καταλῦσαι τὸν νόμον, ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι) beſides the third præmiall beatitude, *Bleſſed are the meeke*, which certainly though it may containe more, yet excludes not, but principally notes the meeke, obedient ſubjects under government, the non-reſiſters, and therefore hath the ſame promiſe annext which the Law had given in the fifth Commandement ('twas there, That thy dayes may be long in the Land; 'tis here, They ſhall poſſeſſe the earth, τὴν γῆν, which *Pſal.* 37. 11. whence it is cited, refers clearly

to

to the land of *Canaan*, though improved into an higher ſenſe now in the Goſpell.) And againe, beſides the ſeventh beatitude of the peace-makers, or peaceable (εἰρηνοποιοὶ and εἰρηνικοὶ, being equivalent in the Scripture ſtile, *vid. Jam.* 3. 18.) and the eighth, of thoſe that are perſecuted for righteouſneſſe ſake, (whence ſure is not excluded the cauſe of Religion and Chriſtianity it ſelfe) as alſo of taking up the Croſſe (of which I deſigne another diſcourſe to ſpeake more largely) which ſure are oppoſite enough to forcible reſiſting of lawfull Magiſtrates, eſpecially for Religion: beſides all theſe, I ſay, in the introduction to that Sermon, there is in the body of the Sermon it ſelfe, a Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ, which ſure prohibits all forcible reſiſting of violence even to the ὁ πονηρὸς, the injurious or (πονηρὸς from πόνος) troubleſome perſon, which if it ſhould chance to be our King, would not certainly be more lawfully or Chriſtianly reſiſted, then any body elſe; eſpecially, when it is our religion which is invaded, which of all other things a whole Army of plunderers cannot rob us of, (as they may of the cloake, verſ. 40.) and therefore needs not our violence to retaine it; nor is ever injured, but more illuſtrated by our ſuffering. To this may be added the conſideration of the *depoſitum* left by Chriſt with his Diſciples, *pacem*, peace, *John* 14. 27. (which it ſeemes onely the beloved diſciple had recorded) Peace I leave with you, externall peace, for the *pacem meam*, my peace followes after as a gift perhaps peculiar to them that priſed and kept this legacy, and if it be objected that Chriſt came not to ſend peace, but a ſword, *Mat.* 10. 34. that ſure refers not to Chriſts prime counſell or purpoſe, but to the event; what he foreſaw it would be, or what he had determined it ought (which manner of ſpeech is very ordinary in all authours) for the precept is punctuall to *Peter* againſt the uſe of the ſword, and to all the diſciples for preſerving of peace, *Mar.* 9. 50. and to that it is thought the mention of ſalt belongs in that place, which among other qualities is, ἑνωτικὸν unitive, have ſalt in your ſelves, and have peace one with another. On theſe texts many effectuall emphaticall deſcants are added by the Apoſtles, *Rom.* 12. 18. If it be poſſible, as much as in you lieth, live peaceably with all men, and *Heb.* 12. 14. follow peace with all men, διώκετε, an agoniſticall word to run for it as for a prize, or βραβεῖον, and 1 *Theſſ.* 4. 11. φιλοτιμεῖσθαι ἡσυχάζειν,

we render it, ſtudy (it is, be emulous, contend, ſtrive, make it your ambition) to be quiet, to which I ſhall onely adde two places more, *Jam.* 3. 17, 18. The wiſedome which cometh from above is firſt pure, then peaceable, &c. which before, verſ. 13. he had called meekneſſe of wiſdome, then 1 *Pet.* 3. 3. where after direction for the ὑποτασσόμεναι obedience of wives to husbands (and we know the kingdomes relation to the King is beſides others, that of a wife to an husband who is therefore eſpouſed to it with the ring at his Coronation) it is added, ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ τοῦ πραέος καὶ ἡσυχίου πνεύματος, that her bravery conſiſts in the ſincerity (I thinke it ſhould be rendred) of a meeke and quiet ſpirit, which is in the ſight of God of great price. If it be objected, that theſe many places of peace are but generall wide illations againſt reſiſtance, or however, no more pertinent to the caſe about reſiſting of Magiſtrates, then of any other private man: I anſwer, that though I might thus argue, *à minori*, (and alſo aſſume that no other reſiſtance is neare ſo deſtructive of peace, as that reſiſting of the Supreme power, that being indeed the ſhaking of government it ſelfe, which is the band of peace, and the diſſolving of which returnes us to the ſtate of common hoſtility, leaves us a wilderneſſe of Beares or Tygers, not a ſociety of men) yet I ſhall confeſſe, that I intended not to lay any more weight on this part of the Argument, then any man will acknowledge it able to beare, and that therefore before I inferre my concluſion of non-reſiſtance from the making of Chriſtianity, I muſt adde to theſe places ſo paſſionate for peace, another ſort of places concerning obedience, of which (without naming the places being ſo knowne already) I ſhall venture this obſervation, that in the new-Teſtament eſpecially the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles (which were all written in time of the reigne of wicked Heathen bloody adverſaries of Chriſtianity, and can referre to none but thoſe) there is no one Chriſtian vertue, or Article of Faith more cleerly delivered, more effectually inforced upon our underſtandings and affections to be acknowledged by the one (againſt all pretence of Chriſtian liberty to the contrary) and ſubmitted to by the other, then that of obedience to Kings, &c. It were moſt eaſie to vindicate thoſe places from all the gloſſes and ſcholia's that the writers of this year, Mr *Goodwin in anticav.* Mr *Bur.* M. *Bridges, &c.* have invented to free them-

themselves and others from the obedience most strictly required there, but I would not againe trouble any ingenuous man with such extravagant discourses as even now I learnt by experience would be necessary to answer such exceptions, which mens wit or somewhat worse hath produced; besides, those places have beene by others vindicated already. I shall onely say, whosoever can without coloured spectacles find ground for the present resistance in those places of Scripture, *Rom.* 13. 1 *Pet.* 2. 13. 18. &c. so farre as to settle and quiet a conscience, I shall not conceive my understanding fit to duell with his, any more then I would wrestle with a fiend, or combate with the fire, which *Pythagoras* tels me would availe little; he that can be sure that damnation (*Rom.* 13. 2.) signifies not damnation, but some temporary mulct onely (if the King should prove able to inflict it) when, vers. 5. it is added we must needs be subject, not onely for wrath, (*i. e.* feare of temporary punishment) but also for conscience sake, (which when it accuses, bindes over to eternall wrath, or damnation) I professe I know not what camell he may not swallow; I shall onely in the bowels of Christ desire him to consider, what a sad condition it would prove, if being on this confidence engaged, and by Gods hand taken away in this warre he should at Gods tribunall heare Saint *Paul* avouch, that by κείμα or damnation in that place, he did meane no lesse then eternall damnation without repentance: O how would his countenance change, his thoughts trouble him, the joynts of his loynes be loosed, and his knees smite one against another, one generall σύγχυσις possesse all his faculties, and M. *Bridg.* &c. be unable to settle him or give him confidence any longer, when the *Tekel* shall come out of the wall over against that interpretation of his, that it is weighed in the ballance (of truth and judgement) and found wanting; Of this word κείμα I designe another disquisition: onely I could not deferre to forewarne the Reader of his danger in this place, and now I shall not doubt from the making of Christianity to inferre my conclusion of non-resistance, not doubting but the premisses will beare it.

For the other part of this third Argument from the making of the Protestant Doctrine, I would faine be very briefe by way of compensation for my former importunity, and therefore shall engage my selfe not to trouble the Reader with citations or names,

which yet might be brought by hundreds of reformed Writers for every *Junius Brutus*, and *Buchanan* that hath appeared for the contrary since the Reformation. Though the truth is, such as these if they must be called Protestants, are yet in this somewhat more then that title ever imported, I may say perfect Jesuits in their principles, and resolutions concerning Kings (no Papist of any other Order hath gone so farre) although they differ somewhat in the seat of that power of making such resistance. That which I designed to say on this point is onely this; That the doctrine of Allegiance to Kings, and of their supremacy in all causes, hath alwayes beene counted a principall head of difference betweene the Protestants and the worst of Papists, and a speciall evidence, which most men have used, to conclude the Papacy to be ὁ Ἀντίχριστος the Antichrist, is this that the Pope exalteth himselfe above all that is called God: 1. The Kings of the earth, that he in case the King be not a Catholicke, absolves Subjects from their Allegiance to him, that he pretends power over them in spirituall things, and in temporall *in ordine ad spiritualia*. It is not unknowne to any that the Oath of Supemacy if not of Allegiance among us is principally designed to discerne and discover Papists, of whom, one of the prayers appointed for the fifth of *November* affirmes, that their Religion is Rebellion, that sure is, that one maine difference betwixt Romish and English, Popish and Protestant doctrine is that of liberty to Rebell in some cases, particularly in that of Religion: In opposition to all which doctrines or insinuations of theirs, there is no Church that ever expresst their sense in any Article more fully and largely, then ours hath in this particular, witnesse the severall parts of the Homily of Disobedience and Rebellion, printed in Queene *Elizabeths* time. And if herein all other parts of the Reformed Church have not gone as farre as we, yet shall I not retract my asserting this doctrine purely Protestant, 1. Because this Kingdome hath alwayes beene esteemed a prime part of the Reformation, wherein the Papacy was legally cast out, not by violence or tumults of the people, and so nothing rejected but what in sobriety was necessary to be rejected, and therefore our Church hath generally beene the *Norma* or rule by which others have desired to compose themselves, and never yet any other so preferred before us, as that our ancestours could

could thinke fit to conforme to them, 2. Because in many other countries the government is not Regall, or Monarchicall, as here it is, *Bodin. l. 2. c. 5. de rep.* can finde none of this nature in *Europe*; but *France* and *Spaine*, and *England* and *Scotland* (I conceive *Ireland* he conteined under the word *Anglium*) in which, saith he, *Reges sine controversiâ jura omnia majestatis habent per se: Singulis civibus nec universis fas est* (it seemes Master *Dale* our Embassadour from whom he had received his advertisements of the state of this Kingdome had not then heard that our King though *Singulis major* is *universis minor*, which certainly had divested him of all Soveraignty, it being impossible that the Soveraigne or Supreme of all should be *Minor* then any) *Summi principis vitam, famam aut fortunas in discrimen vocare, seu vi, seu judicio constituto id fiat, &c.* As for the Emperour of *Germany*, *Charles* the fifth by name, he saith plainly, *Tyrannide cives ad rempublicam oppressit, cùm jura majestatis non haberet*, which if it be true will be some excuse to the Germane Princes in what they did at that time in taking up Armes for Religion, though it is most certaine what he affirmes, that when those Princes consulted *M. Luther* about it, *num id jure divino liceret*, whether it were lawfull in the sight of God, *Ille negavit*, he resolved it utterly unlawfull: this answer saith *Bodin*, *Luther* gave *Perinde atque si* Carolus *summam imperii solus haberet*, and therefore much more must it be given when the case is of a Monarch indeed, as he concludes; and though he acknowledge that distinction, which it seemes *Luther* did not, betwixt that Emperour and true Monarchs, yet is he faine to passe a sad observation upon the fact of those Princes in taking up Armes for Religion, against *Luther's* advice, *Ita funestum bellum reique publicæ calamitosum susceptum est, cum ingenti principum ac civium strage, quia justa causa nulla videri potest adversus patriam arma sumendi.* I would to God those words were Englisht in every of our hearts: a direfull and calamitous war with the slaughter of all sorts, because (though it were for Religion) yet no cause can be counted just of taking up Armes against one's country. The truth is, what was done there though, 1. very unhappily, and 2. against no Monarch, hath been thought imitable by *Knox* and *Buchanan* in *Scotland*, and from thence infused into some few into *England* as *Penry*, &c. But by Gods providence hath formerly beene timously restrained, and

not broken out to the defaming of our Protestant profession. It seemes now our sinnes are ripe for such a judgement, the land divided into two extreame sinfull parts; one by their sinnes fitted to suffer under this doctrine, others sinfull enough to be permitted to broach and prosecute it. I meekly thanke God, that though my sins are strangely great, yet he hath not given me up to that latter judgement. I conceive I have also given some hints at least of proving my position from the making of the Protestant Doctrine.

Now for the last Topicke, taken from the constitution of this Kingdome. Though that be the Lawyers taske, very prosperously undertaken by others, yet one generall notion there is of our Laws, which from my childhood I have imbibed, and therefore conceive common to all others with me; and it is this, That the Lawes of this Kingdome put no man (no Papists I am sure) to death for Religion. When Jesuits and Seminary-Priests have suffered, every man is so perfect in the Law, as to know that it is for Treason, by a Statute that makes it such for them to come into this kingdome. The truth of this, and the constant pleading of it against all Objecters, hath made me swallow it as a principle of our Law, that even Popery strictly taken (and not onely as now this last yeare it hath learnt to enlarge its importance) is no capitall crime. From whence, I professe, I know no impediment to forbid me to conclude, that in the constitution of our State no warre for Religion is accounted a lawfull warre; for that it should be lawfull to kill whole multitudes without any enditement, yea, and by attempting it, to endanger, at least, our owne, 1. Many good Protestants lives, for that, which if it were proved against any single man, would not touch his life in the least degree, is, I must acknowledge, one of the *Arcana belli* which I cannot see into. And therefore *Sleidan* tels us of *M. Luther*, that he would not allow a warre, though but defensive, with the Turke himselfe, *com. lib.* 13. *pag.* 403. and though after he had mitigated his opinion upon a new state of the question, and perswaded the Emperour to it, yet it was with this limitation, *Modò nec vindictæ, nec gloriæ, nec emolumenti causâ subeatur*, (three things that are very rarely kept out of warre) *sed tantùm ut parcissimum latronem, non ex religionis, sed furti & injuriarum actione aggrediantur.* It seemes the cause of Religion,

gion, although it were of Christianity against Mahometisme, was not to him a sufficient warrant for a defensive warre. But then 2. For this warre to be waged against the Prince, (or by any one but the Prince, in a Monarchie, as this is) who whatsoever he hath not, hath certainly the power of the sword immediatly from God (or else must be acknowledged not to have it at all, for this power cannot be in any people originally, or any where but in God, and therefore it may be most truly said, that though the regall power were confest to be first given by the people, yet the power of the sword, wherewith regality is endowed, would be a superaddition of Gods, never belonging to regall or whatever other power, till God annext it, in *Gen.*9.6. which also seemes to be out of all dispute in this kingdome, even at this time, where the universall body of the commonalty, even by those that would have the regall power originally in them, is not yet affirmed to have any aggregate power, any farther then every man single out of government was presumed to have over himselfe, which sure was not power of his owne life: for even in nature there is *Felonia de se*, and therefore the representative body of the Commons, is so farre from being a Judicature in capitall matters, that it cannot administer an oath) and therefore is not justly invasible by any subject, or community of subjects, who certainly have not that power, nor pretend to have it, and when they take it, thinke it necessary to excuse that fact by pretence of necessity, which every body knowes, is the colour for those things which have no ordinary meanes of justifying them (like that which Divines say of saving of children and ideots, &c. by some extraordinary way.) Nay, 3. For this warre to be waged, not against Popery, truly so called, but against the onely true Protestant Religion, as it stands (and by attempting to make new Lawes is acknowledged as yet to stand) establisht by the old Lawes of the Land, and therefore is faine to be called Popish (and our Martyr-reformers not able, by those fiery chariots of theirs, to get out of the confines of *Babylon*) that it may be fit to be destroyed; just as the Primitive Christians were by the persecuters put in wilde beasts skins, that in those shapes they might be devoured: this I confesse is to me a complication of riddles, (and therefore put by some Artists under that deep-dark-phrase, and title of Fundamentall Lawes of the Kingdome) to which certainly no liberty or right

of

of the ſubject in *Magna Charta*, no nor legiſlative power, will enable any man to give any intelligible, much leſſe legall name: At which I profeſſe I am not ill pleaſed, becauſe this I hope will keepe it from being recorded to poſterity.

I have done with my fourth Argument, and am heartily ſorry I have kept my Reader ſo long from his prayers, which muſt ſet an end to this controverſie, for ſure Arguments are too blunt to doe it; I beſeech God to direct all our hearts to a conſtant uſe of thoſe meanes (together with faſting and abſtinence, at leaſt from farther provoking ſins) to exorcize that evill ſpirit that hath divided his titles (of ἐχθρὸς ἄνης, Σάτανας, διάβολος, κατήγορος τῶν ἀδελφῶν, and now at length, ἀβαδδὼν, & ἀπολλύων) among us, and by thoſe meanes infuſed his mortiferous poyſon into the very veines of this whole Kingdome. [I create the fruit of the lips, peace, peace to him that is farre off, &c. and I will heale him. Thou haſt moved the land, and divided it, heale the ſores thereof, for it ſhaketh.]

Of the word κρίμα.

The word κρίμα, according to its origination ſignifies Cenſure, Judgement, and in its making hath no intimation, either of the quality of the offence to which that judgement belongs, or of the Judge who inflicts it: that it belongs to humane judgements, or ſentences of temporall puniſhments ſometimes, is apparent by *Luke* 23. 40. where one thiefe ſaith to the other, ὅτι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κρίματι εἶ, meaning it ſeemes, the ſame ſentence of death, or capitall puniſhment, called κρίμα θανάτου, c. 24. 20. judgement of death temporall; and that at other times it ſignifies alſo divine judgement, is as apparent, *Act.* 24. 26. περὶ κρίματος περὶ μέλλοντος κρίνεσθαι, judgement to come, that is, certainly at the end of this world, at the day of doome. So *Rom.* 2. 2. κρίμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, the judgement of God, and ſo againe, verſ. 3. which verſ. 5. is explained to be wrath or puniſhment againſt the day of wrath, &c. ſo *Heb.* 6. 2. reſurrection of the dead, and eternall judgement. The truth is in this ſenſe it is moſt-what taken in this Book, ſee *Matth.* 23. 14 *Mar.* 12. 40. *Luke* 20. 47. *Rom.* 3. 8. and therefore *Heſychius*, the beſt Gloſſary for the new-Teſtament, renders it κρίμα, ἀνταπόδοσις Θεοῦ, Gods retribution or payment, or rendering according to works. It will not be worth while to ſurvey and conſider every place where the word is uſed, he that ſhall doe ſo, will perhaps reſolve with me to accept of that gloſſary, and underſtand it conſtantly of Gods

Gods judgment; unleſſe, when the circumſtances of the place ſhall enforce the contrary, as they doe in the places firſt mentioned, and 1 *Cor.* 6. 7. But then when the context rather leades to the ſecond ſenſe, there will be great danger for any man to apply it to humane judgements, for by ſo doing, he may flatter himſelfe or others in ſome ſin, and run into that κρίμα, as it ſignifies eternall judgement, when by that miſ-underſtanding he doth not conceive himſelfe in any danger of it. Of places which without all controverſie thus interpret themſelves, I will mention two, 2 *Pet.* 2. 3. οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἐκπάλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ, we render it, whoſe judgement of a long time lingereth not: which that it belongs to eternall vengeance, appeares by the next words, ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει. we render it, Their damnation, it is literally, Their deſtruction ſleepeth not. The ſecond place is, 1 *Tim.* 3. 6. ἵνα κρίμα ἐμπέσῃ τοῦ διαβόλου, fall into the condemnation of the Devill; that is, ſure into that ſentence that fell upon *Lucifer* for his pride (being caſt out of Heaven, and reſerved to chaines of eternall darkneſſe) for the perſon ſpoken of here, is the Novice, or new Convert, lifted up with pride, juſt parallel to the Angells newly created, lifted up with pride alſo, the crimes and the perſons parallel, and ſo ſure the puniſhment alſo. Now three places more there are which appeare to me by the ſame meanes of evidence, or rule of interpreting, to belong to the ſame ſenſe, though I cannot ſay of them as I did before, [without controverſie] For I ſee it is not onely doubted by ſome, whether they doe belong to this ſenſe or no, but that it is reſolved they doe not: which reſolution ſure muſt be obnoxious to ſome danger, that I ſay no worſe of it. The firſt of theſe places is, *Rom.* 13. 2. οἱ δὲ ἀντιστάντες ἑαυτοῖς κρίμα λήψονται: we render it, They that reſiſt ſhall receive to themſelves damnation: But ſay others, it muſt be rendered judgement, as that ſignifies ſome temporary puniſhment which the higher powers may inflict, and nothing elſe: and this they labour to make appear by the words following: For Rulers are a terrour to evill works, and he beareth not the ſword in vaine, &c. To which I anſwer, That there is no doubt made by me or any, but that Rulers are to puniſh men for evill works, particularly that of reſiſtance againſt them, and not onely that, but alſo crimes againſt our brethren, and God; and in that reſpect it is added, verſ. 4.

θεοῦ διάκονός ἐστιν ἔκδικος εἰς ὀργὴν τῷ τὸ κακὸν πράσσοντι, the Minister or officer of God he is, and executioner for wrath, that is, punishment temporall to him (indefinitely) that doth evill. But doth it follow from hence, that either he that makes forcible resistance against the Superiour or Supreme power, or that commits any other sin (which the Supreme power is set to avenge or punish temporally) shall incurre no eternall punishment? If this new Divinity should be entertained, it must be priviledge and protection to other sins, as well as resistance and rebellion, even to all that any judiciall lawes have power to punish, for in these also he is the Minister of God, ἔκδικος εἰς ὀργὴν, an avenger, or executioner for punishment, and there is no avoiding it; but this must be extended indefinitely, or universally, τῷ τὸ κακὸν πράσσοντι, to any malefactour punishable by that power, or that comes under this cognisance; and so by this Logicke, he that is hanged, may not be damned, what ever his crime be, an execution on earth shall be as good as a Purgatory to excuse him from any other punishment. But then secondly, suppose a Rebell escape the hand of justice here below, by flight, &c. nay, that he prosper in his rebellion, and get the better of it, that the King be not able to punish him; nay, yet farther, that he proceed higher, Depose the King, and get into his place, What κρίμα is he like to receive, if that signifie onely the Kings wrath or temporall punishment? Sure this prosperousnesse of the crime must make it cease to be a crime, make it commence vertue, as the Turkes on their principles are wont to resolve it, saith *Busbequius*, *Ep.* 4. —*Ex opinione qua Turcis insedit ut res quocunque consilio institutas, si bene cadunt, ad Deum Authorem referant, &c.* Or else give it, (though it be a sinne never so great, and unrepented of) perfect impunity both in this world, and in another; And certainly this is no jest, for he that observes the behaviours of many men, (the no manner of regrets or reluctancies in their course of forcible resistance, (save onely when they conceive it goes not on so prosperously as it was wont) and the great weekly industry that is used to perswade all men of the continued prosperity of the side, as being conceived farre more usefull and instrumentall to their ends, then the demonstration of the justice of it, mens consciences being resolved more by the Diurnall, then the Bible, by the Intelligencer

then

then the Divine, unleſſe he turne Intelligencer alſo, I would we had not ſo many of thoſe Pluraliſts.) Will have reaſon to reſolve that this Divinity is the principle by which they move; which if it be not yet brought to abſurdities enough, then looke a little forward to the concluſion, deduced and infer'd, verſ. 5. Wherefore ye muſt be ſubject, not onely for wrath, but alſo for conſcience ſake. Words by Prophetick Spirit added by the Apoſtle, as it were on purpoſe to contradict *in terminis*, that new interpretation. Wrath ſignifies that temporall puniſhment, verſ. 4. which if it were the all that is meant by κρίμα, then how can it be true, that we muſt be ſubject not onely for wrath? Certainly he that reſiſts is not ſubject (ἀνυπότακτος is all one with ἀντιτασσόμενος and both directly contrary to ὑποτάσσεσθαι, the word uſed both in the third and fifth verſe) and therefore if we muſt be ſubject not onely for wrath, as that ſignifies temporall puniſhment, then he that reſiſts, ſhall receive more then wrath, as that ſignifies temporall puniſhment, viz: κρίμα, in our rendering, condemnation, if he doe not prevent it timouſly by repentance: which ſure is the importance of the ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ συνείδησιν, but alſo for conſcience ſake; that if he doe it not, it will be ſinne to him, wound his conſcience, binde him over to that puniſhment which belongs to an accuſing conſcience, (which ſure is more then a temporall mulct) which is farther cleare from the firſt verſe of that chapter, the command of ſubjection. For ſure every Divine or Apoſtolicall command entred into the Canon of Scripture, doth binde conſcience, and the breach of it knowne and deliberate, is no leſſe then a damning ſin, even under the Goſpell, mortiferous and deſtructive without repentance, which is juſt equivalent to the κρίμα λήψεται, he ſhall receive damnation in our way of interpreting it. So much for that firſt place.

The ſecond is, 1 *Cor.* 11. 29. He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth & drinketh damnation (or as our margent, judgement) to himſelfe, &c. This place I finde avouched for the confirming of the former interpretation, *Rom.* 13. That κρίμα ſignifies onely Temporall puniſhment, and thus it is known the Socinians cómonly interpret this place, *per κρίμα non ſempiternam damnationẽ nominatim, ſed ſupplicium in genere intelligendum eſſe*. Volkelius *l.* 3. *de ver. rel. l.* 4. *c.* 22. That which is uſed to perſwade this to be probable is

that which followes vers. 30. for this cause many are weake and sickly among you, and many sleep, which belonging onely to Temporall punishments, is conceived to be a periphrasis of the κρίμα judgement, which should seeme consequently to be so also: and indeed, *Volkelius* hath added other proofes, 1. Because the Apostle speaks of any one single act of this sinne of unworthy receiving (not of any habit, or custome) which he conceives not actually damning now under the second covenant, 2. Because it is vers. 32. and when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord that we should not be condemned, &c. To these three (and I know not that there are produced any more) probabilities, I conceive cleare satisfaction may be given by those who affirme κρίμα to containe in it eternall punishment; Though if it were onely Temporall punishment, yet being sicknesse, &c. which are not inflicted by the Magistrate, but by the hand of God, it will not come home to that which was by Master *Br.* affirmed of the word, in *Rom.* 13. For this must be premised, that we doe not conceive it to signifie eternall punishments, *exclusivè*, or so as to exclude temporall, but eternall and sometimes Temporall too (for so sure he that for his Rebellion receives damnation, hereafter, is not secured from being hang'd, drawne, and quarter'd here) or else eternall if he repent not, and perhaps Temporall though he doe by κρίμα, as I said, I understand with *Hesychius*, ἀνταπόδοσιν Θεοῦ, Gods vengeance whether here, or in another world, but I say in this place both of them, (and so ordinarily in the former also. This being premised, the word κρίμα may still containe in it eternall punishments, vers. 29. though many for this cause of unworthy receiving did fall sicke and die, vers. 30. for 1. they might both die and be damned too, or if as *Volkelius* saith, the word κοιμῶνται, *obdormiscunt*, sleep, be never used in the New-Testament, of those that are destined to eternall destruction, then still may this be very reconcileable with our interpretation that many for this cause are weak and sickly, and many others sleep, God chastising some by diseases to reforme them, and punishing others, who as *Volkelius* acknowledges, were guilty onely of some single act of the sin onely, with death temporall or shortning their dayes: which certainly hinders not but that God might punish others that did customarily commit this sinne (and perhaps with greater aggravations) with no lesse then

eternall

eternall death, however that it were just for him to doe so, what ever he did it is plaine by verſ. 27. which is parallel to the 29. whoſoever ſhall eat and drinke unworthily, ſhall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, that is in *Volkelius* his owne words, *Ipſum Chriſti corpus ac ſanguinem contemnere & ignominiâ afficere, ac quantum in ipſis eſt profanare proculcareque conſendi ſunt*, ſhall be thought to contemne and diſgrace, and as much as in them lies to profane, and tread under feet the body and blood of Chriſt, which what is it but to count the blood of the Covenant an unholy thing, *Heb.* 10. 29? Which yet there is uſed as a maine aggravation of that ſin, for which, ſaith the Apoſtle there remaines no more ſacrifice, verſ. 26. It is apparent that the phraſe ἔνοχος ἔσται τοῦ σώματος, guilty of the body, &c. is parallel to the Latine, *Reus Majeſtatis*, uſed for a Traytour, and ſure ſignifies no leſſe then a guilt of a great injury to Chriſt, which how any man can affirme to be a ſinne to which no damnation belongs (ſuppoſing no antidote of invincible ignorance or weakneſſe, nor recovery by repentance, nor gracious pardon of God in not imputing ſome ſingle act of it) I profeſſe my ſelfe not to diſcerne, though I thinke I have weighed impartially all that is ſaid of it. This ſure will keep the firſt proofe from being any longer probable, and for the ſecond, (or firſt of *Volkelius*) it is already in effect anſwered too, for though he that is guilty onely of ſome one act of this ſin found mercy, yet ſure they that are guilty of the cuſtomary ſin, may ſpeed worſe, and indeed of all indefinitely the Apoſtle ſpeaks according to the ſin, as when he ſaith the drunkard and adulterer ſhall not inherit the kingdome of God. Where yet perhaps he that is guilty onely of one ſuch act may finde mercy. For the laſt proofe, I conceive it ſo farre from being a probable one againſt me, that I ſhall reſolve it a convincing one on my ſide, for if thoſe that were ſicke, &c. were chaſtned of the Lord, that they ſhould not be condemned, then ſure if they had not beene ſo chaſtned, nor reformed by that chaſtning, they ſhould have beene condemned with the worlde, and ſo their temporall judgements may be a meanes through the mercy of God in Chriſt to free them from their eternall, but not an argument that eternall was not due to them, but a perfect intimation, that it was.

The third place (which is not indeed of much importance in it

ſelfe, but onely is uſed to give countenance to the interpretation in the two former places) is 1 *Pet.* 4. 17. the time is come that judgement muſt begin at the houſe of God. Here, ſay they, κρίμα judgement is that that befalls the houſe of God, the godly; therefore but temporall judgements.

To which I anſwer in a word, that here is a miſtake in applying judgement in its latitude to the houſe of God, when onely it is affirmed by Saint *Peter* of the πρῶτον κρίμα, or τὸ πρῶτον, the beginning or firſt part of judgement: for of the κρίμα or judgement in this verſe, there are ſpecified two parts, τὸ πρῶτον, the firſt part, and τὸ τέλος the end (or as the word τέλος ſeemes to ſound in our Engliſh, the taile) of it, as *Pſal.* 75. 8. the cup of Gods diſpleaſure, or punitive juſtice, is ſuppoſed to conſiſt of two parts, 1. red wine (or ἄκρατον) and 2. mixture of Myrrhe and other poyſonous bitter ſpices, called θυμός, *Apocal.* 4. 10. & χολή, *Matth.* 24. 17. and both together, οἶνον ἐσμυρνισμένον *myrrhate* wine, *Mark.* 15. 25. Now this cup is powred out, and taſted of indefinitely, by the godly ſome part of it; but the dregs thereof, *i. e.* the myrrhe-bitter part, that goes to the bottome, is left for the wicked to wring out and drinke: ſo that onely the tolerable, ſupportable, eaſie part of the judgement belongs unto the godly, but the end, the dregs, the unſupportable part, to thoſe that obey not the Goſpell of God. Or yet a little further, the beginning or firſt part, τὸ πρῶτον of the judgement, is ἀφ' ἡμῶν, from the godly (and ſo it was ἄρξασθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου θεοῦ) intimating that the judgement doth not ſtay upon them, but onely take riſe from them; but the τὸ τέλος, the ſecond ſadder part of it, is τῶν ἀπειθούντων of them, (or belongs to them) that obey not, &c. So that ſtill in this place alſo κρίμα ſignifies Gods judgement of this life and another both; not of this life onely, to the excluding of the other, but one part in this life, another in that other; and though the godly had their part in it, yet there was ſomewhat in the κρίμα that the godly never taſted of, but onely the ἀπειθοῦντες, they that diſobeyed the Goſpell of God, and this is apparent by verſ. 18. For if the righteous μόλις σώζεται, we read it ſcarcely be ſaved. It ſignifies (by comparing that place with *Prov.* 11. 31. where inſtead of recompenced on the earth, the Greek tranſlation reads μόλις σώζεται) be rendred unto, or recompenſed, *i. e.* puniſhed in the earth, then where ſhall the ungodly and ſinners appeare?

There

There are againe the two parts of κρίμα, one ἀνταπόδοσις θεοῦ, Gods retribution to sin here, wherein the godly have their part, and the other his rendring to the wicked hereafter, and so neither of them the punishment of the Magistrate in this life, as Mr *Bridg.* out of *Piscator*, contends to have it, *Rom.* 13. and as it must be here also, if others speake pertinently, who use it to avoid that interpretation, which I confesse Mr *Bridg.* doth not.

They that are unlearned and unstable wrest the Scriptures to their owne destruction, yee therefore beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware lest you also be led away with the errour of the wicked, fall from your owne stedfastnesse, 2 Pet. 3. 16, 17.

Of

Of the Zealots among the IEWES, and the Liberty taken by them.

THere was among the Jewes either truly or pretendedly a *judicium Zelotarum*, a peculiar liberty or power of Zelots (*i. e.* of private men led by zeale) to punish or execute malefactors, whether with death, or any lower punishment: These they stile Pious-men inflamed with the zeale of God: and these were wont when they found any man in the fact, guilty of sedition, blasphemy, or any other crime of the greater size, openly and publickly committed, presently to set upon him, to smite, and if need were, to kill him, without any processe of Law against him.

The originall of these came from the fact of *Phineez*, *Num.* 25. 7. of whom *Mattathias*, in his dying oration to his sonnes, hath these words, φινεὲς ὁ πατὴς ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ ζηλῶσαι ζῆλον ἔλαβε διαθήκην Ἱερωσύνης αἰωνίου. *Phineez* our father (by zealing the zeale of God, saith the vulgar Latine) by behaving himselfe zealously, received the promise of an eternall Priesthood, 1 *Mac.* 2.54. Which is also affirmed of *Elias*, vers. 58. Ηλίας ἐν τῷ ζηλῶσαι ζῆλον νόμου ἀνελήφθη εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. *Elias* by zealing the zeale of the law, or behaving himselfe zealously for the law, was received up to Heaven, (which belongs to that fact of *Elias* immediately before his assumption, when he call'd twice for fire from Heaven on *Ahaziah's* messengers, 2 *King.* 1.10, 12. unlesse you will rather apply it to that fact of his, 1 *King.* 18. 40. against the Prophets of *Baal*, whom he apprehended

prehended and slew together every man of them) by which examples he there stirres up and incites his sonnes ζηλῶσαι τῷ νόμῳ, to be zealous for the Law, vers. 50. though not to commit any such particular act of that nature as that which those had done.

Testimonies of Jewish writers to this purpose, Master *Selden* hath put together in his booke, *De jure Natur: & Gent: ad Heb: plac: lib. 4. cap. 4.* and given some hints of explaining some difficulties in the New-Testament from thence. To this belongs that fact of Christ, *Jo.* 2. 15. as appeares by the Disciples: of whom it is said, vers. 17. that upon that occasion they remembred how it was written by the Psalmist, *Psal.* 69. 9. the zeale of thy house, or for thy house, κατέφαγέ με, hath fed on me, or carryed me with a kinde of fury.

That Christ did not take upon him to be a Magistrate, or a Judge, or a publicke person here on earth, is sufficiently acknowledged; as also, that as a private man he neither did, nor attempted any thing contrary to the Laws or Customes of the Jewes or Romans: Or if he had, that the Jewes who had a competent measure of animosity against him, would not probably have suffered him to have done it Scot-free. From all which it will follow undoubtedly, that this was done by Christ *jure Zelotarum* by the power that belonged to the Zealots, for whom onely the law allowed this liberty. The same is to be said of that attempt of the Jewes, *Joh.* 10. 31. ἐβάσταζαν οὖν πάλιν λίθους οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἵνα λιθάσωσιν αὐτόν. the Jewes therefore carried stones againe that they might stone him; no legall processe having preceded.

The same Master *Selden* notes of the Servant of the high Priest that strucke Christ, *Joh.* 18. 22. whose answer is a seeming argument of it, v. 23. If I have spoken well, why smitest thou me? intimating, that if he had said any thing amisse or irreverently of the high Priest, he should not have questioned his striking him: And yet the truth is, the phrase μαρτύρησον περὶ τοῦ κακοῦ, beare witnesse of the evill, seemes an advertisement that if Christ had offended, it would have better become the servant to have accused and witnessed against him, proceeded legally, then thus *jure Zelotarum* to have stricken him. On the same ground was the fact of *Ananias*, *Act.* 23. 2. though sitting in the *Sanhedrin* when he appointed

Paul

Paul to be ſmitten, though without any juſt crime alſo. The like proceedings the Scribes were, it ſeemes, affraid of, *Luk.* 20. 6. *the people will ſtone us*: which muſt have beene an act of popular zeale without publieke judgement. That Saint *Steven*, *Act.* 7. 57. was ſtoned after this manner, is obſerved by *Hugo Grotius*, and certainly upon good reaſons: for although he were accuſed of Blaſphemy, *c.* 6. and falſe witneſſes brought to that purpoſe, yet after that, there was nothing legally paſt againſt him through all the ſeventh chapter, beſide his Apology for himſelfe to the high Prieſt. In the concluſion of which (no ſentence paſſing againſt him) it followes that the people διεπρίοντο ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν καὶ ἔβρυχον τοὺς ὀδόντας ἐπ' αὐτόν, verſ. 54. which *Heſychius* will helpe us to render thus, they were very angry, they were madded with fury or zeale againſt him, and gnaſhed their teeth (it ſeemes that flame of zeale produced the ſame effect in them that the flames of Hell are ſaid to doe, *Matth.* 8. 12.) againſt him, and crying with a loud voice, they ſtopp'd their eares, and ran with one accord upon him (all which, were evidences of a moſt violent zeale) and caſt him out of the City and ſtoned him, which out of doubt was not now lawfull for the Jewes (all power of capitall puniſhment being before this taken from them, *Joh.* 8. 31.) nor before legall condemnation ever lawfull by the common way of proceeding; no nor after condemnation, to be done thus tumultuouſly by the people: ſave onely that by the liberty of Zealots it was permitted. So *Act.* 14. 19. it befell Saint *Paul* (God in his providence permitting him to be thus dealt with, by way of retaliation for his having an hand in ſtoning Saint *Steven*, when *Barnabas* met not with the like adventure) certaine Jewes that came from *Antioch*, and *Iconium* having ſtoned *Paul*, &c. by this judgement onely of zeale which we now ſpeake of.

Hither perhaps we may referre that of the Jewes, who brought the woman taken in Adultery to Chriſt, that ſhe might be ſtoned; not deſiring, as it appeares, that Chriſt ſhould give Sentence of death on her by ordinary legall judicature, (for neither was Chriſt a Judge, nor had the Jewes now power of capitall puniſhment) but by the liberty of Zealots, which was thought principally to belong to that caſe of one taken ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ in the very fact, as ap-

peares by the example of *Phineez*. So *Act.* 23. that Κραυγὴ μεγάλη great cry (such as was observed in the story of Saint *Steven*) was the beginning of the flaming of zeale, and vers. 10. it followes, that the chiefe Captaine or Tribune sent Souldiers to rescue and defend *Paul*, that he might not be taken by that party of Zealots, who vers. 12. had bound themselves under a curse, that they would neither eate nor drinke untill they had slaine *Paul*; who sure could not have done so *impunè*, had it not beene thus indulged to them, as Zealots. So when *James* and *John* demand of Christ, whether they should command fire from Heaven to descend on a Village of the Samaritanes, *Luk.* 9. 54. this they did by the liberty of Zealots, for the legality of their action taking their patterne from the example of *Elias*, and presuming of the power to doe it because *Elias* had. (In reference to both which we read of πνεῦμα καὶ δύναμις Ηλίου, *Luk.* 1. 17. the spirit and power of *Elias*; that spirit, by which he was incited to that act of zeale, and that power by which he could call for fire from Heaven; whereupon it is *Procopius* his expression of *Elias*, that he was θείῳ πυρὶ πολεμούμενος ζήλῳ, attended with divine zeale, or set on fire by it) Now when Christ reprehendeth those Disciples, telling them they knew not, *i. e.* considered not, what spirit they were of, he advertiseth them that this practice of Zealots is not agreeable to the spirit of the Gospell, nor generally to the temper which he came to plant among Christians.

And having now among the Apostles of Christ themselves found some footsteps of the Jewish zeale, 'twill not be amisse to interpose a conjecture, that from the same originall sprung that bloudy fact of *Peter* cutting off *Malchus* his eare, *Matth.* 26, 51. For that this was not lawfull for him to doe, or justifiable by the ordinary rule, may be guest by Christs answer of reproofe and vouching the law, (All they that take the sword, shall perish by the sword) and yet that it was not a fact very enormous among the Jewes, or being compared with their avow'd practises (though cleerly forbidden by the Gospell) *Origen* and *Theophylact* seeme to intimate. *Origen* on *Matth.* 26. *Unus eorum qui erant cum Jesu nondum manifestè concipiens apud se Evangelicam patientiam illam traditam sibi à Christo, nec pacem quam dedit Discipulis suis,*

Tr. 35. p. 118.

sed

sed secundum potestatem datam Judais per legem de inimicis, extendens manum accepit gladium, &c. One of them that were with Iesus having not yet any full cleere conception of that Evangelicall patience delivered them by Christ, nor of that peace which he gave to his Disciples; but according to the power given the Iewes by the law of enemies tooke out his sword, &c. *Theophylact* yet more cleerly in *Matth.* 26. μὴ ἐγκαλῶμεν τῷ Πέτρῳ, ὃ γὰρ ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶ ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ διδασκάλου ζηλώσας τῆς ἐποίησεν, ὁ δὲ κύριος μετεῤῥυθμίζων αὐτὸν εἰς εὐαγγελικὴν πολιτείαν διδάσκει μὴ χρῆσθαι μαχαίρᾳ κἂν ὑπὲρ θεοῦ τις ἐπιθυμῇ. Let us not finde fault with *Peter*; for what he did, he did out of zeale, not for himselfe, but for his Master: but the Lord reducing him to the Gospell-discipline, teaches him not to use the sword, though thereby a man should seeme to defend or vindicate God himselfe. And in another place in *Luk.* Ζηλῶσι μαθηταὶ, καὶ μαχαίρας ἀνασύρονται, the Disciples are mov'd with zeale and draw swords. And in a third place in *Mark.* Ἀποσπασᾶ τὸ ὄνομα ὁ Μάρκος, ἵνα μὴ δόξῃ ἐπαινεῖν ἃ διδάσκαλον αὐτῶ Πέτρον, ὡς ζηλώσαντα ὑπὲρ χριστοῦ, intimating, that *Peter* himselfe counted this fact of his a piece of zeale, for which he might be commended.

Thus much was not amisse to produce in behalfe of this conjecture, that what *Peter* did in defence of Christ, he did as a Zealot; and yet to see, Christ is so farre from approving it, that it incurres the same reprehension, which *James* and *John* before had met with; nay, somewhat a severer, that all might discerne how distant the spirit of Zealots was, from that other of Disciples, the Iudaicall fervour from the meeknesse of the Gospell. Though the Apostles themselves had not yet perfectly learn't this truth at Christs death, nor untill the Holy Ghost came to teach them all things, and to bring to their remembrance whatsoever he had in person being present said unto them.

A plaine mention of these Zealots we finde, *Act.* 21. 20. where of some of the Iewes 'tis said, they are all ζηλωταὶ τ νόμε Zealots of the law, that were like to be very hot if they saw any thing done to the prejudice of the law; of whom therefore Saint *Paul* is advised to beware. So of *Paul* himselfe before his conversion, *Act.* 22. 3. 'tis said he was ζηλωτὴς θεῦ, a Zealot of Gods, or in Gods cause, and presently it followes διώξω ἄχρι θανάτε, I persecuted,

secuted to death, &c. for so the Zealots were wont to doe. So *Act.* 17. 5. ζηλώσαντες Ἰουδαῖοι, the Zealots of the Iewes, or the Iewes inflamed with zeale (as the old Translation reads it *Zelantes*, better then the new, *invidiâ commoti*) of whom 'tis added ὀχλοποιήσαντες ἐθορύβουν τὴν πόλιν. tooke unto themselves certaine lewd fellowes of the baser sort, and made a tumult, and set all the people in an uproare. Of which kinde Master *Selden* has observed, that *Simon* was one, *Luk.* 6. 15. *Act.* 1. 13. called by Saint *Luke* Σίμων ζηλωτής, *Simon* the Zealot; but by the other Evangelists Saint *Matthew* and Saint *Marke*, Καναίτης, or (as *Schindler* and other learned men are bold to mend it) Καννίτης, which we render the Cananite; but 'tis apparent the word is to be fetcht from the Hebrew קנא *Canna*, which signifies Zealot, not from the name of the place: and so is all one with the Greeke Ζηλωτής, as perfectly the same as Πάτερ and *Cephas*, Δόρκας and *Tabitha*, and many the like. And thus farre by Scripture light have we past in this disquisition.

Now what tumults and riots have beene wrought by the rude multitude among the Iewes (or those at least who had no lawfull power in their hand) under the pretence of the priviledge of Zealots, no man can be ignorant, who is not wholly unacquainted with *Iosephus* story. For in his relation there is nothing more ordinary, then to finde all things disturbed by them, the Temple or holy place defiled μιαινομένοις ποσὶ, by their prophane feet to the reproach of God: chiefe Priests removed and others placed in their roome without all respect of bloud, elected by them either according as they pleased; or else by lot, (as it was in the election of one *Phannias* the sonne of *Samuel* to the high Priesthood) a man saith *Iosephus*, who οὐ μόνον ἀνάξιος ἀρχιερεώς, ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἐπιπάμων σαφῶς τί ποτε ἦν ἀρχιερωσύνη διὰ ἀγερωχίαν, was not onely unworthy to be high Priest; but that did not so much as know what the high Priesthood was, such was his rusticity.

Ἅλωσ: βιβ: δ. κ. ιε.

Κ. ιβ.

Many passages we finde scattered in this Authour, in his bookes of the Captivity, and large stories of the seditions & uprores and massacres by two sorts of men among the Iewes; the one called Σικάριοι, Swordmen or Cutters, (of whom Saint *Luke* makes mention, *Act.* 21. 38. we render them *Murtherers*: and it seemes foure thousand of them got together in a company) the second

Ζηλωταί,

Ζηλωταὶ, Zealots; of whom he makes relations, especially *lib.* 4. *c.* 11. where he saith of them, that they killed many of the chiefe men of the Nation, and still when they did so, boasted and bragg'd of themselves, ὡς ἐυεργέτας καὶ σωτῆρας τῆς πόλεως γενομένους, that they were become the benefactors and preservers or saviours of the City. And by the timidity and basenesse of the people concurring with their insolence, advanced so farre ὡς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς εἶναι καὶ τὰς χειροτονίας τῶν ἀρχιερέων: that they tooke to themselves the election and constitution of the high Priests. ἄκυρα γοῦν τὰ γένη ποιήσαντες ἐξ ὧν κατὰ διαδοχὰς οἱ Ἀρχιερεῖς ἀπεδείκνυντο, καθίστασαν ἀσήμους καὶ ἀγεννεῖς, ἵν' ἔχοιεν συνεργοὺς τῶν ἀσεβημάτων. and contemning the rules of birth by which the high Priests were to succeed, they constituted ignoble obscure men in those places, that by that meanes they might have some abetters and partners of their villanies: and c. 12. he saith the name of Zealots was of their owne imposing, ὡς ἐπ' ἀγαθοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν, ἀλλ' οὐ ζηλώσαντες τὰ κάκιστα, τῶν ἔργων καὶ ὑπερβαλλόμενοι, as if all that they did (Murthers, Sacriledges, Prophanations, before mentioned) were by them done in good intentions, and not, as indeed they were, in æmulation, and even to the outstripping and exceeding the worst actions that had beene recorded. Thus farre *Josephus*.

That these Zealots were a fourth Sect of the Jewes, (added to Sadduces, Pharises, Essens,) having its originall from *Judas Gaulonita* and *Sadduchus*, is the affirmation of *Bonaventura Cornelius Bertramus*, in the end of his booke *De polit. Jud.* A Sect, saith he, *Judæis ipsis omnibus perniciosissima, ut quæ Judæorum omnium excidium totiusq; reip. Judaicæ prostrationem non modo accelerârit, sed et eam tam miseram et calamitosam effecerit*: A Sect most sadly pernicious to the Iewes themselves: the destruction of all whom, and the prostration of their whole Common-wealth, it did not onely hasten and præcipitate; but made it so miserable and calamitous when it came.

Having proceeded thus farre by way of narration, it may chance to be worth the paines to present unto the reader a conjecture upon the twelfth vers. of the fourth Chap. of the 1 Epistle of Saint *Peter*, Μὴ ξενίζεσθε τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν πυρώσει, The vulgar Latine renders it by words utterly unintelligible: *nolite peregrinari in fervore: Beza, ne tanquam peregrini exploratione illâ per ignem percellimini*: as if ξενίζεσθαι signified

nified a strangers being stricken or amazed: and πύρωσις triall by fire: which whatsoever it may in some other place, it cannot doe here: because here is added πρὸς πειρασμὸν γινομένη which is befallen for your triall, which word would be superfluous, if πύρωσις noted triall by fire. The more simple and cleare rendring will be to set the words so, that πύρωσις may signifie a combustion, or fire, or burning, (so both the Vulgar and *Beza*, *Revel.* 8.9. render καῦσιν πυρώσεως *fumum incendii*, and the smoke of her burning) and ξενίζεσθαι may denote these 3 things, 1 To wonder (so the Greeke Scholiast, ξενίζεσθαι, θαυμάζειν) 2 To be affrighted: (so *Tertullian*, *ne expaveſcite*) 3 So as it may be all one with ξενοπαθεῖν, to be stricken as with an accident wherewith we are unacquainted. These three senses each, as all of them, may be allowed their places here. Now the conjecture is, that by the πύρωσις, the combustion or burning, &c. should be meant, that notable combustion of the Zealots before-mentioned, (for indeed the words are of some affinity, the one comming from πῦρ, fire, the other from ζέω, growing fervently hot or burning.) The grounds of the conjecture are these, 1 Because that last fatall day, the destruction of Ierusalem is spoken of in that very Chap. vers. 7. as that which for some time had been at hand: for I conceive I can make it plaine by comparing of places of the new Test. that τέλος πάντων the end of all things is (not the finall period of the world, but) that destruction of Ierusalem or the Iewish Common-wealth, and of that it is said, ἤγγικε, it is, or hath for some time beene at hand, it was not yet comen: but of this πύρωσις or combustion, that it was then γινομένη, already come; which is directly agreeable to the observation of *Josephus*, and others conversant in the Iewish, who affirm that that raving and rioting of (and sad civill combustion wrought by) the Zealots, was *antecedent & precursory* to the finall destruction of the Iewes by *Titus*. 2 'Tis affirmd of this πύρωσις that it was γινομένη ἐν ὑμῖν, *i.e.* among you, in your Land, in the midst of you, (as that phrase frequently signifies in the new Test.) by which is marked out some remarkable thing, which was fallen out among the Iewes, as that time when *Peter* wrote; to which time that the raving of the Zealots endured, is apparent by mention of them, *Act.* 21. 20. *Act.* 22. 3. and that by their stirres these Christian Iewes of the διασπορᾶ or the dispersion to whom he writes,

had

had beene first scattered abroad, may be conjectured by *Act. 8. 1.* This may suffice for a conjecture, which whether it stand or fall, will not be much concernant to the businesse which occasioned this παρεργον.

To conclude this historicall uneven discourse, I shall onely annex these few animadversions by way of corollary.

1. That this law, or power, or custome, or liberty of *Zealots*, was never of force but among the Iewes.

2. That the originall and ground of it among them is to be fetcht from hence, that among that people, God immediately presided, and reserved many things to be manag'd & ruled by his peculiar & extraordinary incitation and impulsion, not by any rule of standing publicke law; that so that Common-wealth might be truly capable of that title which *Josephus* bestowed on it, none of the kinds of humane Governments, but θεοκρατια the government of God.

3. That it followes not from hence, that all things which were by the Iewes themselves done under pretence of this right, and passed unpunished, were therefore well done; but onely those which were undertaken by men truly incited by God, (such as *Phineez* and *Elias*) for that priviledge is not therefore stil'd *zeli privati*, of private zeale, because private men by their owne incitation (ἰδια ἐπινοια, as that is opposed to Gods) did what they did; but because they did it without legall processe, or publicke judicature. And though I should be so sceptickall, as not to dare peremptorily to affirme, that nothing was well done or justifiable in that kinde, but what they did who were truly and immediately incited to it by God: yet should I not be so cowardly as to doubt, but that all those Iewes were so bound to observe those examples of *Phineez* and *Elias*, that if they were not immediately incited by God, yet they should not dare to exceed the limits of those patterns commended by God, either in respect of the manner of doing, or matter of the action: in one of which you shall finde all the examples mentioned in the New Testament, except that of Christ, to have miscarried. And therefore I hope no man will be so unjust to the charitable designe of this Paper, so treacherous to his Readers, so unkinde to his owne Soule, as

to borrow from these premises new hints of argument to sustaine a desperate cause by his pretence of zeale: for that would be to extract Roscare out of Treacle, poyson from that which was designed for antidote. And he must withall resolve, that if the practice of Christ first mentioned, be his president, he must also prescribe to Christs power; or if any of the other New Testament examples, he must be content to fall under their condemnation, for not one of them that I ever yet heard of, was excused by any.

4. That this Sect of Zealots when they thus got together into a body was by the Iewes themselves (among whom the priviledge of Zealots was yet in force) taken for the most unlawfull, yea pernicious and fatall, most eminently destructive to that Common-wealth (as appeares by *Iosephus* and *Bertram*) and that those things which they did under pretence of law and colour of zeale, were violations of law and meere sacrilege.

5. That all use of this liberty, all imitation of that Jewish priviledge of Zealots in the Old Testament, is cleerly interdicted all Christians; First, because the written word is the onely Oracle wherein God constantly reveales himselfe to Christians now under the New Testament, neither are any other incitations to be expected from God, but what in the Gospell or New Test. the Δωρεὰ πνεύματος, the administration of the Spirit (as preaching the Gospell is call'd) doth yeild or afford us, what is more then this, yea though it come to us from the Pulpit, savours of enthusiasmes and seducing spirits; Secondly, because Christ hath both by his doctrine and example commended to his Disciples all manner of meeknesse (and Saint *Peter* the meeke and quiet spirit, as most precious in Gods sight under the Gospell, and this a grace most directly contrary to that Spirit of Zealots) yea and hath forbidden all private revenge of injuries (done not onely to our selves, but God) referring all to the Magistrate (whom Saint *Paul* calls θεοῦ διάκονον ἔκδικον εἰς ὀργήν, *Rom.* 13. 4. the minister of God to execute wrath, or an executioner for wrath) and therefore himselfe medled not with the woman taken in Adultery; Thirdly, because he interdicted *James* and *John* the use of this power, adding a reprehension and words emphaticall to this purpose, he turned

ned and rebuked them, saying, *you know not what spirit you are of*; intimating, the Christian spirit to be very distant from that of the Zealots among the Jewes.

I shall adde no more, but my prayer, that as many as have zeale, may have it according to knowledge, and that knowledge, according to the directions of the Gospell.

and excluded them, saying, See how ye walk, that ye are
of [illegible], the Christian spirit to observe from that
of the Zealots among the Jews.

I shall add no more, but my prayer, that as many as have
read, may have according to knowledge, and that knowledge,
according to the direction of the Gospel.

Of taking up the Crosse.

MAny places of the New Testament there are that require this duty of a Christian, of which I thinke I may truly say, that 'tis a duty never so much as in kinde required before by God in the Old Testament, nor by the lawes of nature, or Canons of any other Religion, and so a peculiar Christian duty. The chiefe places are these, *Matth.* 16. 24. If any man will come after me, let him deny himselfe and take up his Crosse, &c. and in the same words in the parallel places, *Mark.* 8. 34. and *Luk.* 9. 23. So againe, to him who desired to be put in a course by Christ to inherit eternall life, *Mark.* 10. 21. in the close, Come, take up the Crosse, and follow me. In all these places 'tis a duty of plaine command; yet somewhat farther, *Mat.* 10. 38. He that taketh not his Crosse and followeth not after me, is not worthy of me: and in *Luk.* 14. 27. the words are most punctuall, and of unlimited extent, from whence 'twill be hard for any man to obtaine any dispensation, or excuse, ὅστις οὐ βαστάζει —— whosoever doth not beare his Crosse and come after me, cannot be my Disciple. No man will be exempted from the ὅστις οὐ —— and no Christian it seemes can be without it; for that is the meaning of [my Disciple,] not onely those peculiar twelve of his, and their successours in the Ministry, for that Relation belongs to them considered under another notion as Apostles sent out after by Christ, answerable to the [illegible] among the Jewes under the

Temple, but the disciples are all true followers of Christ, all sincere Christians, and so the doctrine is most plaine, that whosoever doth not beare (which as from those other former places appeares, implyes, taking up) the Crosse of Christ, cannot be a true Christian.

Now the αἴρειν σταυρον, taking up the Crosse will be easily explaind what it's full importance extends to, the voluntary embracing of shame, contumely, (for the Crosse was a contumelious death *Heb.* 12. 2.) and consequently all other losse of goods, liberty, &c. and beyond that, paine of body and death it selfe: which are said, to be taken up, not when we bring them unnecessarily upon our owne shoulders, (for that is to pull the Crosse upon us) but when by the providence of God they are laid, or permitted to lye in our way to Christ, or Christian obedience, so that we cannot serve Christ perfectly, but it must become detriment or dammage to us, then voluntarily to undergoe that detriment, whatever it is, is to take up the Crosse; and patiently and cheerfully to beare it, is βαστάζειν, to carry or beare the Crosse of Christ, which is the duty, without which a man cannot be a Christian.

There is now one thing to be a little more punctually considered, the strict and neere dependance and connexion betwixt Christianity and the Crosse; and that from the pleasure and providence of God, and dispensation of things under the Gospell, so ordering it generally that we should not serve the Lord our God of that that costs us nothing, but that true Christian piety should bring endurances and sufferings upon us. Thus it is plaine it did to Christ our elder brother; the discharge of the office he had undertaken, brought him to the Crosse, and that Crosse was the onely way to his consecration to the office of high Priest, to which at his resurrection he was inaugurate; *vid. Heb.* 2. 10. it became him, &c. *i.e.* God πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα (not in bringing, but) bringing, (or being about that most gratious and mighty designe of bringing) many sonnes unto glory, τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι by sufferings to consecrate or inaugurate, (for so τελειοῦν critically signifies, being the word solemnely used by

the Septuagint to signify the legall consecration of the Priests under the Law) the captaine of our salvation, that is Christ, who τελειωθεὶς, being so consecrated, became the author of eternall salvation, &c. *Heb.* 5. 9. From hence, without more places it would follow, that we Christians are to expect our τελείωσις (whether consecration to our βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα our dignity of being Kings and Priests, *i. e.* Christians here; or consummation & crowning hereafter, as τελείωσις also signifies (τελείωσις ἀθλητοῦ. *Nyss:*) by the same method and meanes that our captaine had his, which is διὰ παθημάτων by sufferings: which course of divine Oeconomy is so generall and without exception, (2 *Tim.* 3, 12. yea, and all that will be godly in this world, διωχθήσονται, shall be persecuted) that *Heb.* 12. 6, 7, 8. the words are very remarkeable, Whom God loveth, he chastneth, and scourgeth *every* sonne whom he receiveth, if you endure chastning, God dealeth with you as with sonnes, for *what sonne* is he whom the father chastneth not? but if you be without chastisement whereof *all* are partakers, then are you bastards, and not sonnes. Words of a large unlimited latitude, which I cannot discern any way in the world to soften, so as they may be supportable to him, that (as the Psalmist saith) hath no changes, hath enjoyed an age of an uninterrupted continued prosperity, without ever having the Crosse on his shoulders. I confesse I would faine finde out some μαλακτικὸν or mollifying distinction, as that of the *animus martyris*, the preparation to suffer, though God never send occasion, that that might suffice for his qualification, who hath no other, but sure that will not be able to allay or take off the force of [& chastneth every sonne, &c.] and if ye be without, not onely if you be not prepared to beare, but if you be without chastisement, then are you bastards, &c. which when it is set downe as an aphorisme of divine observation under the Kingdome of Christ, an Axiome of Gods Gospell-providence, there will be no safety in disputing or labouring to avoyd the literall importance of it. To that purpose I conceive those words tend *Rom.* 8, 28. where to prove the conclusion premised, vers. 28. that all things tend to the good of them that love God,

(and

(and what those *all things* are, is specified, vers. 35. tribulation, distresse, persecution, famine, nakednesse, danger, sword.) the Apostle thus argues: For whom he hath foreknown, *i. e.* fore-appointed, the lovers of God premised, those he hath also predestin'd to be conformable to the image of his Sonne, *i. e.* in suffering; and whom he hath predestined, those he hath also called; to wit, to that conformity to which he hath predestined them, (as 1 *Pet.* 2. 21. the phrase is used, εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκλήθητε, for to this ye were called, *i. e.* to this suffering as Christ did, and *v.* 3. 9. ye are thereunto called, that you should inherit εὐλογίαν, blessing (not as we render it, a blessing) *i. e.* that ye should blesse enemies as Christ did, and so inherit that exemplary grace of his, which as a grace may as properly be said to be inherited; thus the context seemes to inforce it [not rendring evill for evill, but blessing, knowing that you are thereunto called, that you should inherit blessing, &c. *i. e.* possesse that grace after him, so eminently discernible in him.] and whom he hath thus called, he justified and glorified. Where the first and second proposition must be acknowledged universall, that all whom he hath foreknowne, all lovers of God, are thus predestined, and all that are predestined called (by their very title or profession of Christians) to this conformity with Christ in sufferings. Adde to these 1 *Pet.* 4. 18. if the righteous hardly be saved; which must be understood by the sence of the Hebrew phrase, *Prov.* 11. 30. rendred by the 72. Εἰ δίκαιος μόλις σώζεται, and here retained by Saint *Peter*, and then the sence will be [and if the righteous be recompenced, *i. e.* by an *Hebraisme*, punisht in the earth, &c. or more literally to the Greeke, if he escape hardly or with difficulty.] (as 1 *Cor.* 3. 15. ζημιωθήσεται· σωθήσεται δέ, he shall be mulcted or suffer losse, but shall escape) which interpretation the former verse in Saint *Peter* confirmes [ὅτι ὁ καιρὸς τοῦ ἄρξασθαι τὸ κρίμα ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου θεοῦ] for it is the season of that act of divine dispensation, *viz.* of judgements beginning from the house of God, *i. e.* of Gods inflicting judgements of this life (which are the beginning or first part (τὸ πρῶτον as it followes) of Gods retribution for sinne) on the

Godly]

Godly] which signifies that the state of the Gospell, is that season, though the Law was not: and to the same purpose, the verse following also, ὥστε πάσχοντες κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ &c. They that suffer according to the will of God. It seemes by all put together, that the μόλις σώζεται [scarcely saved] is spoken of suffering, and the will or providence of God is that that disposesse it so, and so the conclusion from thence is clear, and universall. The righteous shall be punisht in the earth. 'Tis true indeeed, under the Old-Testament we finde not any such œconomy, but promises of a long and happy life, in a temporall *Canaan* to the obedient servants of God (though sometimes, God was pleased to interpose some variety in this kind, many troubles of the righteous in *Davids* time) but under the Gospell 'tis quite contrary, even those duties which are promised a reward on this earth, as mercifulnesse or almesgiving, are yet to expect the payment of this reward with some mixture (like *Homers* good cup powred out alwayes with a dash of the bad) the hundred-fold which such men are promised to receive ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ —— in this time, this first inferiour harvest of retributions, though they be secular blessings, houses, and lands, &c. yet must they be with persecutions, *Mark*, 10. 30. Which particular though neither S. *Matthew* nor S. *Luke* records yet S. *Peter* (who had most reason punctually to observe those words of Christ, being an answer directed to a question of his proposing, as all the three Evangelists acknowledge) remembred them, and so we find them in S. *Markes* Gospell, which is resolved to have been dictated by Saint *Peter*.

Having thus farre in the passage briefly pointed at this piece of Gospell — Providence, 'twill not be amisse as briefly to guesse at the ends of this divine Oeconomy. 1 To administer occasion of the practice and exercise of many Christian duties, and graces, as of patience, meekneesse, waiting on Christ, of loving our enemies, of the ἀντισῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ the non-resisting evill, we render it, or not using any violence against him that molests us, (rendring [τῷ πονηρῷ] of the Person, &c.) which if we have in seed or habit, 'tis certainly a great felicity to us,

to meet with oportunityes to actuate them, both in respect of the evidenceing the sincerity of them to God, to our brethren, to our owne soules; and in respect of that reward, or Crowne promised, the great degree of glory, *Matth.* 5. 12. that is proportioned to the τὸ ἔργον according to his worke, *Psal.* 62. 12. 2 *Cor.* 5. 10. ἵνα κομίσηται ἕκαστος πρὸς ἃ ἔπραξε according to the nature and number of the Acts, or operations of those guifts or graces, as on the other side, a greater portion of the Torments of hell is allotted to the more multiplyed acts of wilfull sinne. 2 To helpe to mortify any remainders of sinne in us, which by continued prosperity are ready and apt to take root, and reflourish in us. 3 To assimilate, or make us like to Christ, to conforme us to the image of his sonne, *Rom.* 8. 29. that is the image of the crucified Saviour, as was said, that he might be the first borne of many brethren, that is, might have a Church or family, a multitude of brethren like himselfe, all sufferers as he was. 4 That our sins being punished here, there might remaine no arreare to be paid in another world; having had all our Purgatory here, there might remaine nothing but Heaven hereafter; which the Apostle expresseth 1 *Cor.* 11. 32. We are chastned of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the World: to which Father *Abraham* referres *Luke* 16. 25. *Lazarus* received his evill things in this life time, and now he is comforted.

These and such like being the designes of this act of Gods Gospell—Providence; It is next observable what a character the Spirit of God sets upon the Crosse, *i.e.* Tribulation or affliction here, that it is the happiest, blessedest estate, the most comfortable joyfull condition that a Christian can meet with. This riddle and paradox, or prodigy to carnall reason, is become the most ordinary beaten acknowledged truth in the new Testament. 'Tis the close of the beatitudes in that institution of Christians, the Sermon in the mount, *Matth.* 5. 10. Blessed are they that are persecuted, and vers. 11. reviled: and the exhortation in this case χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε rejoyce, and be exceeding glad, so *Luke* 6. 22. (which there is some reason to thinke was spoken by Christ at another time)

blessed.

blessed are you when men shall hate you, and separate you, and reproach you, and cast you out, &c. χαίρετε καὶ σκιρτήσατε, rejoyce ye in that day, and leape for joy, &c. Saint *Paul* had learnt this, *Col.* 1. 24. who now rejoyce in my sufferings, yea, and glory too. 2 *Cor.* 11. 30. 12. 5. 9. S. *James* his exhortation is remarkable in the front of his *Ep.* 1. 2. My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers Temptations, πᾶσαν χαρὰν, all joy: *i. e.* The most joyous accident possible, and vers. 12. blessed is the man that endureth Temptation, &c. & *cap.* 5. 11. ἰδοὺ μακαρίζομεν τοὺς ὑπομείναντας, behold we count them happy, we render it; it signifies more; behold we acount them as a kinde of Saints in Heaven, (for so ὁ μάκαρ usually signifies) and *Aristotle* speaking of some heroicall super-humane excellencies, οὐκ ἀνθρώπινα, saith he, ἀλλὰ μακαρίζομεν) it seemes that of suffering, a most blessed condition. To these adde Saint *Peter*, 1. *Ep.* 3. 15. but sanctifie the Lord God in your hearts; where the word ἁγιάζειν is to sanctifie as that is all one with glorifying or hallowing, or praysing; a consequent of the generall rule, vers. 14. if ye suffer for righteousnesse sake, happy are yee; and perfectly opposite to [being afraid of their terror, & being troubled,] in the end of that vers. and so is an expression of this duty of praysing, thanking, blessing God for our sufferings in this life. So againe, 1 *Ep.* 4. 13. μὴ ξενίζεσθε, vers. 12. be not frighted or stricken, &c. but rejoyce in as much as you are partakers of Christs sufferings, and vers. 14. If ye be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are you, &c. and vers. 16. If any suffer as a Christian (not as a murtherer, a thiefe, an evill doer, a busie-body in other mens matters, vers. 15. no great joy or comfort in any of those sufferings) let him not be ashamed but let him glorifie God on this behalfe, ὅτι ὁ καιρὸς τοῦ ἄρξασθαι τὸ κρίμα, that it is the season for judgement to begin, or of judgements beginning, at the house of God, as hath beene explained, 'tis seasonable that the τὸ πρῶτον, the first part of Gods ἀνταπόδοσις rettribution to sinne, that which is in this life, should befall the house of God, Christians, and the most obedient of them; and being so, this is matter of rejoycing, and glorifying God. Other places ye will observe easily to the same

purpose, let these for the present suffice, to soften this carnall paradox.

But now having proceeded thus farre in a matter, to him that is conversant in the new Testament, so obvious and vulgar, that I shall presume it matter of wonder to him, what should move me to so superfluous and unnecessary an undertaking; I must now take confidence to proceed to that which *Arrian* cals the ἐφαρμογὴ προλήψεως πρὸς ἑκάστην ὑπόθεσιν, the applying of κοιναὶ ἔννοιαι knowne and granted principles, to particular persons, or cases, or practices. For therein as that excellent Philosopher observes, consists the ground and beginning of all strife and difficulty, and difference, betwixt men; no man having any considerable Temptation, to keepe him from consenting to the truth of a generall proposition sufficiently assert, as long as he appeares not concern'd in it, and yet every man almost having some irreconcileable quarrell to it, when his actions are required to be ruled by it; hence is it, that the speculative part of knowledge, is farre easier then the practicall; and as *Aristotle* saith, the Mathematicks which are the most abstruse Science, are most easie to be learnt by a young man, or a dissolute, of any the most untamed affections, so he have but an ordinary naturall capacity, (and 'tis evident by his *Organon*, that he supposed children to have learnt Geometry before they came to Logicke) whereas of the precepts of Morality, such are utterly uncapable λέγειν ἢ πράττειν. they can recite them by rote, but beleeve not a word of them.

I wish it were now uncharitable to affirme the same of many that have taken upon them, to be the best, and most reforming Christians amongst us; that it continued still to be but our jealousie, what is now proved our sense, that some of those who have hitherto beene admired for our strictest Christians, have at length confest themselves fartherest from the merit, and true desert of that title, if the doctrine of the crosse which hitherto we have laid down for acknowledged truth, doe not at last prove a fable.

The Apostle *Phil.* 3. 18. tels us even weeping, that there are many

many walkers, (I thinke he meanes by that phraſe πολλοὶ περιπατοῦσι, Chriſtian profeſſors) whom judging by their actions, he cannot chuſe but call ἐχθροὺς τ σαυρ τ χριστ (of whom it ſeemes he had oft admoniſhed them, ἔλεγον πολλάκις κ νῦν λέγω) enemies of the Croſſe of Chriſt; what thoſe were in the Apoſtles time will not be pertinent now to examine, I ſhall onely with a ſad heart (not deſiring to judge my brother, but if it were poſſible, to direct him to prejudge, or at leaſt examine himſelfe, and ſo either anticipate and prevent, or elſe prepare himſelfe to approach with confidence Gods judgement, and withall, to helpe undeceive others whom we finde ductile to ſome moderne ſinnes, much-what upon that dangerous prepoſſeſſion which the Apoſtle calls having mens perſons in admiration) make theſe few quære's, and leave every mans owne ſoule to anſwer them.

1. Suppoſing our grounds layd to be true, I demand whether it be the temper of a true Chriſtian, and not rather of an enemy of the Croſſe of Chriſt, inſtead of rejoycing To repine and murmure under the Croſſe, and evidence that by ſpeaking evill of thoſe powers who have layd it on our ſhoulders?

2. To be more refractary after ſuch ſufferings (inſtead of being more meeke and more humble) more violent in matters of indifferency (by our owne continued practice acknowledged to be ſo in our account, till after ſuch ſufferings our judgements or rather our practice altered) and more reſolv'd not to yeild obedience in them, then before we thought our ſelves bound to be.

3. To plot and project, and to that purpoſe to hold correſpondence with other men, (whom we conceive already moved with diſcontents, or our ſelves have labour'd ſo to move) to finde out the moſt probable way of delivering us from the Croſſe, whatſoever that way be, beſide our addreſſes to God in prayer to remove it, if he ſee it beſt for us in all reſpects.

4. To make uſe of any meanes to this purpoſe, which we are not aſſured is adminiſtred and offered unto us by God, of

which we can no way possibly be assured but by the evident goodnesse and justifiableness, at least, lawfulnesse in all respects of that meanes which we thus designe to make use of.

5. To move or stirre the quiet and peace of one or more Kingdomes (though not principally yet collaterally, or at all) in this contemplation that we shall get the Crosse off from our owne shoulders, come to a more prosperous condition, yea though it be but to a more peaceable enjoying of our manner of Religion, then hitherto we have attained to.

6. To venture on, and (though not primarily to designe, if it may be done without it, yet if it may not, then secondarily and consequently) to resolve on the shedding of any one mans bloud, which we know would not otherwise be shed, especially if it proceed further to the waging or but occasioning of a warre, in which (whether offensive or defensive on our parts) it cannot be hoped but a great effusion of Christian and Protestant bloud will follow.

7. To attempt or desire the removing of the Land-markes, the altering of the Government of Church and State, the working of any considerable change in either (which we can have no revelation to assure us may not prove author of some inconvenience which we foresee not) the better to secure our selves or others that the Crosse shall not returne to our shoulders againe.

8. To thinke it just and reasonable (and our selves injur'd if it be not so) that we should have the greater portion of secular dignities for the future in regard of some former sufferings of ours; which if it should befall us, would be parallel to that curse, *Matth. 6. mercedem habent*, they have their reward, in this life.

9. To endeavour to lay this Crosse on other mens shoulders of which we have freed our owne, whether those other men be such as were not guilty of our former sufferings, but perhaps pitied and mourned, and prayed for us, (for that were rewarding good with evill) or whether they be our greatest persecuters (for that will be rendring evill for evill, most perfectly

perfectly contrary to Christs doctrine, *Matth. 6. 44. Rom. 12. 17, 19, 20, 21.*

Secondly, supposing things to be as now they are in this Kingdome, my question is, First, whether we have no great reason to believe, that (the doctrine of the Crosse being not so well laid to heart by those who three yeares since conceived themselves the principall Schollers in that Schoole) God is now pleased to call another sort of men into that forme, to try whether they will prove better proficients then their predecessours have done; Secondly, whether those on whom that lot is now falne, be not most eminently bound to glorifie God in this behalfe, *1 Pet. 4. 16.* Thirdly, whether by the experience of other mens failings in this kind they have not reason to be earnest in prayer to God, and diligent in using and improving all Gods directions for the due Christian discharging of so glorious, and withall, so difficult a Taske, that when they are proved to the utmost, are brought forth to resist to bloud they may be found faithfull. Fourthly, whether the obtaining of this grace from God be not more highly conducible to every mans owne individuall interests, then the removing of the Crosse from us, though wrought most directly and by meanes administred undoubtedly by God himselfe. Fifthly, whether it can become a Christian to make use of any meanes which he is not on sure grounds satisfied to be purely and perfectly lawfull (*i. e.* agreeable first to the Gospell-rule of obedience to Christ in every particular, and second to the lawfull commands of our undoubted Superiours not contradicted by any law or power higher then they) to get now either totally or in part from this Crosse, *i. e.* from any pressure which in the discharge of a good conscience God shall permit to fall on any of us.

When every man in this broken State, and Church, most sadly militant, of what perswasions soever he be, hath laid the severall parts of these two Quære's to his heart, and examined himselfe by them (which truly I should not have laid thus plainely before him, had I had any other thought or aime, but this one of making it impossible for him to be blinde

blinde in judgeing himselfe) I shall hope he will pardon his Monitor, and save this paper the labour of proceeding further to beare witnesse against him at any other tribunall then this of his owne conscience.

The Lord prosper this short discourse to the end to which it is designed.

A

A Vindication of Christs reprehending Saint *Peter*, from the Exceptions of Master *Marshall*.

Vid. supra pag. 9.

THere is nothing more unjust and uningenuous, then M. *Marshall's* dealing about Christs reprehension of Saint *Peter's* using the Sword: whilst he labours to answer the Objection, which from thence is brought against the use of Armes, though but defensive, taken up against a lawfull Magistrate. The Argument is briefly this: Saint *Peter*, in defence of his Master (Christ himselfe) drew his Sword, and cut off the Eare of *Malchus*, one of the High Priests Servants, sent by Commission from their Masters, to apprehend Jesus: and our Saviour commands him to put up his Sword; adding by way of reason, *for they that take the sword* (take it not when 'tis put into their hands by God or the supreme Magistrate, or any Delegate of his, who hath the power of the Sword; but take it, usurpe it, without legall authority or concession, giving or permitting it to them) *shall perish by the sword.* Which reason or backing of Christs reprehension is brought to inferre, that 'tis a sinne for any to use the Sword against the supreme Magistrate, though for defence of Christ or Christian Religion. To this Master *Marshall's* answer is three-fold; 1. *That the speech of Christ to* Peter, *is not a reproofe of the sword taken for a just defence; but of the*

sword taken for unjust oppression, and a comfort to those who are oppressed with it. For Origen, Theophylact, Titus, Euthymius, *interpret the meaning to be, that Christ doth not rebuke* Peter *for using defensive Armes; but rather* Peter *know that he need not snatch Gods worke out of his hands: for God would in time punish those with the sword, that came thus with the sword against him. And that these words are a prophecy of the punishment which the Roman sword should exact of the bloody Jewish nation, according with the like expression,* Revel. 13. 10. *He that kills with the sword, must be killed with the sword: here is the patience and faith of the Saints,* i.e. *this way comfort the Saints in their persecutions that God will take vengeance for them:* and for all this the Margine advises the Reader to consult *Grotius de jure belli, l. 1. c. 3. n. 3.* This is the place at length in Master *Marshall* his Letter to a friend; which (being of some concernement and importance to the present controversie of the times, though not to confirme his cause by this exposition, yet to dispatch one of his speciall adversaries out of the way) I shall now begge leave to examine; and of altogether, observe these foure things; First, that the ancient Writers, vouched by him, are not vouched from his owne reading, but taken upon trust from *Grotius*, as also the observation of the Roman Sword, and the place in the *Revelations*; Secondly, that the interpretation, asserted by him out of them, is not asserted by them; Thirdly, that it is not asserted by *Grotius*; Fourthly, that *Grotius* to whom he owes all this seeming aid to his cause, is the most declared enemy of this whole cause of his, in behalfe of defensive resistance of the Magistrate, that he could possibly have falne on; and upon occasion of these words of Christ to *Peter* hath said as much against it. If these foure things be made good; I cannot guesse what could be further added to prove the injustice and uningenuousnesse, I shall adde, the untowardnesse and unluckinesse of this answer. And for the particulars, I shall but require a reader with eyes in his head, and supposse him not possest with a beliefe of an absolute infallibility in Master *Marshall*, and then I shall be confident to demonstrate them.

For the first, the proofe will be short, if you please but to looke on *Grotius* in the place directed to in his Annotations on the Gospells, *pag.* 465. almost *verbatim* transcribing what he had before published *de jure belli*; you shall in each finde every of the particulars mentioned: but for this I would not charge Master *Marshall*. I wish he would alwayes gleane out of so good writers. The onely fault here is, that having borrowed so much from him and digested it into nourishment of his owne errour, he did not also take the paines to borrow what was present to be had, a most soveraigne antidote for his owne poyson, meanes of rectifying his mistake: but like the man in *Gellius*, that had eate so much poyson, and therewith so invenom'd his bloud, that he could poyson the Flea that came to bite him: so, he the *Grotius* that came to pricke and wound; or, if he had pleased, to convert, to bring him to repentance.

For the second, I shall not expect to evince it against so great an authority of Master *Marshall*, without transcribing the very words of those writers in this matter. *Origen* upon the place in *Matth.* 26. *tr.* 35. *p.* 218. explaines the whole period in these words, (I shall omit no word that is pertinent to the matter in hand:) *Unus eorum qui erant cum Jesu, nondum manifestè concipiens apud se Evangelicam patientiam illam traditam sibi à Christo, nec pacem quam dedit discipulis suis, sed secundum potestatem datam Judæis per legem de inimicis, extendens manum accepit gladium, &c.* Peter it seemes had not perfectly learned the doctrine of Christian patience, and the peace which Christ commended to his Disciples, but proceeded according to the Jewish law of dealing with enemies. This concludes *Peters* act contrary to Christian patience and peaceablenesse, and so makes him capable of Christs reproofe, which Mr *Marshall* will wholly divert from him, and cast upon the Jewes. Then he goes on, *Mox Jesus ad eum, converte gladium in locum suum: Est ergo gladii locus aliquis, ex quo non licet decipere eum, qui non vult perire maximè in gladio.* (This clearly of Saint *Peter* againe, and not the Jewes, that he must not take the sword out of its place, unlesse

he will be content to perish by the sword:) *Pacificos enim vult esse Jesus discipulos suos, ut bellicum gladium hunc deponentes,* (O that Master *Marshall* would remember this; and after so faire an admonition, put the military sword out of his mouth also.) *alterum pontificium accipiant gladium, quem dicit Scriptura gladium Spiritûs. Simile autem mihi videtur quod dicit, Omnes qui accipiunt, &c. i. e. omnes qui non pacifici, sed belli concitatores sunt, in eo bello peribunt quod concitant, &c. Et puto quòd omnes tumultuosi & concitatores bellorum, & conturbantes animas hominum, maximè Ecclesiarum, accipiunt gladium, in quo & ipsi peribunt.* Excellent seasonable doctrine for these times if it might be laid to heart; but no way excusing Saint *Peter*. Againe, *Qui accipiunt gladium, &c. cavere nos convenit, ut* ne occasione militiæ *vel vindictæ propriarum injuriarum* (remember not for revenge of ones owne injuries) *eximamus gladium, aut ob aliquam occasionem, quam omnem abominatur hæc Christi doctrina, præcipiens ut impleamus quod scriptum est, Cum his qui oderunt pacem, eram pacificus. Si ergo cum odientibus pacem debemus esse pacifici; adversus neminem gladio uti debemus.* These are the words of *Origen*; out of which, he that shall inferre that *Origen* conceived the meaning of the Scripture to be, that Christ did not rebuke *Peter* for using defensive Armes against *Malchus*; I shall resolve, he hath gotten the Philosophers stone, is Alchymist enough to extract fire out of water; any the most contrary tenie out of any words. Not so much as one word here of the Jewes or the Roman sword that should give them their payment: but all of *Peters* Sword; and the miscarriages of that: and so much for *Origen*.

What if a man should construe this (*not on occasion of the Militia.*

In Matth. p. 162.

Then for *Theophylact*; he is also punctuall enough to this purpose. Μὴ ἐγκαλῶμεν τῷ Πέτρῳ, ὁ γὰρ ἐποίει, οὐχ ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλὰ ὑπὲρ τοῦ διδασκάλου. *Let us not finde fault with Peter* (mette not too much hast Master *Marshall* to catch that, till you see the consequents) *for he did this not for himselfe, but in zeale for his Master.* (herein I shall interpose my conjecture that *Theophylact* might thinke *Peter* did this, as a Zealot; as *James* and *John* would have destroyed the Village

of

of the Samaritanes, *jure Zelotarum*: so his words also sound on *Luke*, *pag.* 518. Ζηλῦσι μαθηταὶ καὶ μαχαίρας ἀνασύρονται: and then though that were unlawfull for a Christian, a piece of Judaisme outdated by Christ; yet in *Peter*, as a Jew, not perfectly illuminate or instructed in the Christian doctrine (as *Origen* before observ'd) it was not so blameable yet, till after the coming of the Holy Ghost, who was to bring all things to their remembrance which Christ had taught them. And therefore perhaps it is, that, although Saint *Augustine* calls this of *Peter*, *carnalem amorem*; yet *amorem Magistri* still. The same Authour upon Saint *Marke* hath these words upon this same occasion, Ἀποσιωπᾶ τὸ ὄνομα ὁ Μάρκος, ἵνα μὴ δόξῃ ἐπαινεῖν τὸν διδάσκαλον αὐτοῦ Πέτρον, ὡς ζηλώσαντα ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ. counting this zeale, as in a Jew, rather a commendable thing. If all this be yeilded, yet will it be no justification of the like in a Christian: because now Christ hath reformed that law, and checkt that *Peter*. And therefore, the same *Theophylact* goes on; that though we should not aggravate *Peters* fault, nor chide him for it; ὁ δὲ Κυριὸς μεταρυθμίζων αὐτὸν εἰς εὐαγγελικὴν πολιτείαν διδάσκει μὴ χρῆσθαι μαχαίρᾳ κἂν τὸν θεὸν δοκῇ τὶς ἐκδικεῖν· *yet Christ reformes him, turnes him to the Gospell-discipline, and teaches him not to use the sword, though by so doing he seeme to defend or vindicate God himselfe.* Could any man have spoken more expresly or prophetically against Mr. *Marshall* his doctrine, then this father doth. (So likewise in other places upon Saint *Lukes* Gospell, *pag.* 518. Ζηλοῦσι δ' οἱ μαθηταὶ, &c. ἐπιτιμᾶται δὲ ὁ θέρμος Πέτρος ὡς ἐπὶ τῷ σκόπῳ τοῦ κυρίου ζήλῳ χρησάμενος· he confesses *Peter* was chid for his zeale. And on Saint *Johns* Gospell, Ἀλλ' ὁ Κυριὸς καταστέλλει μὲν τὸν Πέτρον, καὶ ἀπειλήσας, βάλε, φησί, &c. *The Lord reprehends* Peter, *and threatning saith, put up*; &c. threatning *whom?* sure that person, in *Theophylacts* opinion, to whom he said *put up*: and that sure was *Peter*, not the Jewes) But to shew you the occasion of Master *Marshall* his mistake; It followes indeed in *Theophylact* on *Matthew*, Αἰνίττεται δὲ ὅτι διὰ τῆς Ῥωμαίων μαχαίρας ἀναιρεθήσονται οἱ κατ' αὐτοῦ λαβόντες τὴν μαχαίραν Ἰουδαῖοι. *Insinuat autem*, as *Oecolampadius* renders it. *Christ insinuates*

 that

that by the Romans sword, the Jewes that tooke the sword against him, shall be destroyed. This acknowledged truth, (that the Romans should destroy the Jewes, the apprehenders and crucifiers of Christ, *i. e.* that were guilty of crucifying Him,) was, saith he, insinuated in those words of Christ, wherein, as before we shewed out of *Theophylacts* words, he reproved Saint *Peter*. Now we know that αἰνίττεσθαι, or insinuating, or intimating, signifies a secundary or allegoricall sense of a Scripture, as it is frequent in that Author. Speaking of the cutting off *Malchus* his Eare, αἰνίττεται γὰρ, saith he, he *insinuates*, ὅτι παρήκοοι ἦσαν καὶ ἀπειθεῖς, that the Jewes did not *heare* and *obey* the Scripture, as they should: a meere allegoricall interpretation. So when Christ bids him *that had no sword, sell his garment and buy one, Luk.* 22. 36. πολέμους αἰνίττεται, &c. he speaks ænigmatically: and tells them by way of insinuation, what warres and dangers should betide them. Which insinuated or ænigmaticall sense, though it be acknowledged true, will not evacuate that other literall. For I hope in Master *Marshall* his owne judgement, that 'tis lawfull to use a sword in ones owne defence in time of warre and danger, and that that lawfulnesse is authorized by Christ in those words: which I shall not doubt to acknowledge with him, if it be not against the lawfull Magistrate.

The product then of *Theophylacts* interpretation will be this; that by those words, (*for all they that take the sword, shall perish by the sword*) Christ reprehends and chides *Peter* for drawing his sword, and using it, as he did: and withall insinuates ænigmatically the destruction of the Jewes by the Romans. Which if it be acknowledged true in both senses, 'twill no way prejudice us, or serve Master *Marshall*, whose cause depends upon rejecting of the former sense, not on asserting the latter: and doth not onely affirme that it is a reproofe of the sword taken for unjust oppression, but also that it is not a reproofe of the sword taken for just defence: which is absolutely false in *Theophylacts* opinion, if defending of Christ be just defence, or chiding be reproving: or if teaching not to use the sword, though one seeme to defend

God

God himself, he rebuking *Peter* for using defensive Armes for Christ. The short is, though *Theoph*: interpretation bring the Jewes under Christs threatning & reprehension; yet doth it no way free *Peter* from the same; but primarily subjects him to it: The contrary to which is the onely thing would be for Master *Marshall* his purpose. 'Tis true indeed, in his *Scholia* on Saint *John*, he saith, *Christ comforted Peter*, which seemes opposite to *rebuking*: but that was not in those words, *For they that take the sword*, &c. but in those, *the cup*, &c. (παραμυθεῖται δὲ ἐν τῷ φιλεῖν τὸ ποτήριον, &c.) which Saint *John* immediately adds, omitting the words of the threatning out of the law. And so much for *Theophylact* also.

Now that which hath beene thus largely set downe out of *Theoph*: will sufficiently cleare this whole businesse without proceeding to examine what may be found in *Titus Bostrensis*, or *Euthymius*, to this purpose. The former of these, in his Exposition of Saint *Luke* in the *Bibliotheca patrum Græc*: hath not the least word sounding that way, but rather contrary; interpreting Christs command of buying a sword as a designation onely of the Jewes preparation against him, Καὶ ὅτι μέλλουσιν αὐτὸν συλλαμβάνειν, and that they were about to apprehend him: which (as *Theophylact* did, so) he calls αἴνιγμα μαχαίρας, the intimation of the sword, and saith, that therefore Christ adds, that the things written of him must be fulfilled. And againe, that if Christ would have had his Disciples use any humane helpe at his apprehension, a hundred swords would not have beene sufficient, εἰ δὲ μὴ τοῦτο, καὶ αἱ δύο περιτταί, and if he would not, even these two would be too many. But all this he saith upon the passage of the two swords. The truth is in the exposition of the Gospell, he saith nothing of this reprehension of *Peter*, but passes it over in silence: And for his notes on S^t. *Matthew*, as also for *Euthymius* his, though I confesse, that I have them not by me, yet (besides that I finde nothing that way in those *Excerpta* that *Lucas Burgensis* hath out of them, who would not probably have omitted the mention of such a rarity if it were there,) I thinke I may take upon me at a venture to say, that he that examines

those

those bookes, shall not possibly meet with more then out of *Theophylact* was cited: These three Expositors running generally on the same notions, and all of them for the most part gleaning from *Chrysostome* being (*Euthymius* his scholler, *Titus* his profest Epitomater) who I am sure hath nothing in favour of this exposition. Out of him, as the *Homer* of those after-expositers, I shall transcribe these few passages, πρὸς δεῖξιν in his homil: 54. on *Matth. c.* 26. Why did he bid buy a Sword? to give them assurance that he should be betray'd: οὐχ ἵνα ὁπλίσωνται, (ἅπαστε) ἀλλὰ τὴν παράδοσιν δηλῶν· not that they should be armed on that occasion (away with that) but to signifie his betraying. Then that their having those two weapons at that time was upon occasion of killing the Lambe for the Passeover, and the Disciples then coming from Supper, and hearing that some would come to apprehend him, tooke them out from thence with them, ὡς πολεμήσοντες ὑπὲρ τοῦ διδασκάλου, meaning to fight for their Master, ὁ τῆς ἐκείνων γνώμης ἦν μόνον, which was their opinion onely, not Christs intention: διὸ ἐπιτιμᾶται ὁ Πετρὸς αὐτῇ χρησάμενος, wherefore *Peter* is chid for using of it: καὶ μετὰ σφοδρᾶς ἀπειλῆς, and that with a sound threat; which what can it be, but that about which we now contend *they that take the sword*, &c. upon the hearing of which words saith he, he straight obeyed and did so no more. Againe, citing the passage in Saint *Luke*, τῷ μαθητῇ ἐπιτίμησε καὶ ἠπείλησεν ἵνα πείσῃ, he chid and threatned the Disciples into obedience; and then sets downe the words of the threat, πάντες γὰρ, &c. *for all that take* &c. And yet after all these plaine words of reprehending and threatning *Peter* in those words (*all they that take the sword, shall perish by it*) he yet adds that he *comforted* his Disciples by two things, first the punishment of the betrayers, applying to that the same speech in a Parenthesis (*They that take*, &c.) and that he suffer'd not unwillingly. All which together signifie clearly the same that we found in *Theophylact* (and presume the utmost either of *Titus* or *Euthymius* their exposition) that in that threatning of *Peter* is intimated also or insinuated ænigmatically a threat of those other sword-men that came out with swords and

staves

staves to take *Jesus*: which will not be denyed by any, or disputed of by me; so the other be granted, *viz.* that *Peter* was here reprehended and threatned, which is the onely thing we quarrell in Mr. *M.* And so much for the second undertaking.

Now, that in the third place, *Grotius* himselfe who cites these foure ancients, and is here cited by Mr. *M. de jure belli, l. 1. c. 2. n. 5.* doth not in this place, or any other of his writings, assert this interpretation; I shall thus prove. The thing that in that place he hath in hand is to inquire, Whether all use of the sword for a mans owne defence, be unlawfull under the Gospell? And he resolves, that in case of one private mans being invaded by another, 'tis lawfull by the Law of Christ (not necessary, but lawfull; a man is onely not obliged to the contrary) or notwithstanding the prescribed rules of Christian patience, to kill another in defence of my owne life. Against this, 3 objections he mentions out of the new Testament. *Matth.* 5. 39. *Rom.* 12. 19. and the saying of Christ to *Peter*, put up thy sword, &c. For all they that take the sword, &c. To those 3 he answers.

1. By opposing some other places of Scripture, that of Christ to his followers, *Lu.* 22. 36. that to buy a sword they should sell a coat. In which company of his auditors there were, saith he, at that time none but his Disciples, & although, saith he, it be a proverbiall speech, signifying the great dangers approaching; yet it referr'd to the ordinary use of swords at that time, for private mens defence in time of danger, not there prohibited by him: applying that of *Cicero*, *Gladios habere cerve non liceret, sinus illis nullo pacto liceret*: We might not be allowed to have swords, if 'twere in no case lawfull to use them. Which still confirmes his point in hand, that in some case, the use of the private sword is lawfull.

2. He proceeds to the particular places, saith in the *τὸ ἀντιναι τῇ πονηρῷ*, there is some exception allowed, that it binds onely in tolerable injuries; such as the box on the checke, &c. there mention'd: in the *μὴ ἀδικοῦντες ἑαυτὸν, ἀδικεῖν* signifyes not defence, but revenge. Then for that of *Peter*, it con-

teins, saith he, a prohibition of using the sword, but not in case of defence: for he needed not defend himselfe; for Christ had said, let these go: *John* 18.8. Nor Christ, for he would not be defended, &c. Besides, saith he, *Peter* tooke up the sword (*in eos qui nomine publicarum potestatum adventabant, quibus an ullo casu resistere liceat, peculiaris est quæstio, infra à nobis peculiariter tractanda.*) against those that came in the name of the publick powers, against whom, whether it be lawfull to make resistance in any case, is a peculiar question, to be handled afterward peculiarly. (And let me pawne my faith for it, Stated negatively.) As for that which Christ addes; All they that take the sword, &c. that is, either a Proverb or, (which is the opinion of *Origen, Theophylact, Titus, and Euthymius,*) *indicat*, it shewes or intimates, that we should not snatch revenge out of Gods hands; and to this applies the place in the *Revel.* a place in *Tertull. adeò idoneus patientiæ sequester Deus, &c.* and addes *Simúlque his Christi verbis vaticinium videtur inesse de pœnis, quas a sanguinariis Judæis erat exactarus gladius Romanus.* And also in the words there seems to be included a Prophecy of the punishment that the Romane sword should exact of the bloudy Jewes. From all which put together this will be the utmost that Mr. *M.* can conclude, that *Grotius* conceived, that the speech of Christ to *Peter* prohibited not all use of the sword, for private defence (no man saith it did; or that all such defence is unlawfull, our case is onely of resisting magistrates) that *Origen, Theophylact, &c.* owned an exposition of it, that thereby we should be taught, not to take Gods office of revenging out of his hand, (which we also make a speciall part of the importance of that speech, both there, and in the *Revel.* and so a plaine checke of *Peter*, who did take it) and that withall in these words a prophecy seemes to be implied of the revenge of Christs death, wrought by *Titus* upon the Jewes, (And we can acknowledge the Scripture, so rich a mine of variety, that it may have this propheticke sense also: though by the way, *Grotius* cites not this out of those 4 writers, (nor could he, for in *Origen* we finde it not) but as from himselfe, *simulq́ vaticinium*

ticinium videtur inesse, &c. But for the literall sense that *Peter* should not be rebuked by Christ, for using defensive armes against the magistrate, (when with the use of those, the leaving vengeance to God is utterly unreconcileable) the Christians conceive themselves bound not to use those armes against the Magistrate for this very cause, because he is *accountable, punishable, revengeable by* God alone:) and yet be rebuked for snatching Gods worke out of his hand. Or that these words should not belong in the prime sense to *Peters* fact, as well as in a secundary prophetical seeming one to the Iewes, there is not any appearances of found of any word in *Grotius* there, or in any other place in that booke, or his large annotations on the Gospels: Which if Mr. *Manshall* had read with his owne eyes, he would confesse with me. And so much for his citation of *Grotius*.

Now in the last place, for the opinion of this learned man *Grotius*, (an excellent Casuist, exactly distinguishing the severall obligations of Nature, of *Moses*, and of Christ, a Protestant, and, if an Arminian, farre from deserving that part of the censure which Mr. *Cheynel* laies on such, of being as lawlesse as that faction at Munster, whose Law it was *magistratibus ac Principibus nullus subsidetur*) in the businesse of taking up armes against a King for just defence, I shall refer you to his first Booke, *de jure belli, &c. cap.* 4. (Not that I can hope you will be moved with his authority when he appeares against you, that is not the manner of men now a dayes to be content to be tried by your owne witnesses but for the satisfaction to conscience which this authors reason, and perspicuity will yeeld any Christian reader) the very place whereto he referr'd the reader even now for his resolution in that point; and the state of this question being set (*An aut privatis aut publicis personis bellum gerere liceat de quarum imperio subsint*) whether any private or publick persons may lawfully wage warre against them, under whose command they are, he defines, that by the very Law of Nature (so much now talkt of) 'tis not lawfull. 2. That by the Law of the Iewes it was not allowed. 3. That it was also allowed,

Of Socin. p. 53.

but become more unlawfull by the Evangelical Law, *Rom.* 13. 2. & 1 *Pet.* 2. 13. &c. And practice of ancient Christians. 4 Confutes the opinion of those that affirm it lawfull for inferiour magistrates to wage warre against the supreme, by reasons and Scriptures. 5 Proposes the case of extreme and inevitable necessity, when the King goes to take away a mans life unjustly: and (whatsoever might from nature or practice of the Iewes, as of *David*, or of the Macchabees be brought to affert resistance in this case) he defines from the Christian Law, (which commands so oft to take up the Crosse) an exacter degree of patience, and particularly when for Religion our Superiours go about to kill us, though he will allow flight to some sort of men, yet to no man more then flight; but rather rejoycing when we suffer as Christians: This, saith he, was the course that brought Christian Religion to such a height in the World: and resolves it the greatest injury that can be done to the ancient Christians, to say, that it was want of strength, not of inclinations that way, that they defended not themselves in time of most certaine danger of death. *Tertullian*, saith he, had beene imprudent and impudent, if in a writing presented to the Emperours (who could not be ignorant of the truth) he had dared to lye so confidently, when he saith: *Non deesset nobis vis numerorum, &c.* most admirable passages out of ancient writers he there cites for a leafe together to the same purpose of dying for the truth of Religion; and never defending themselves by armes against the illegall will of the lawfull Magistrates. (I beseech Mr. *Marshall* to send to the shop and read the passages & consider how farre he hath departed from the primitivenes and Christianity of those examples.) And to conclude, Though *Grotius* (according to his manner, which is to say all that can be wisht in any Subject) mentions some cases wherein a King may be resisted, yet if you read them, you will finde little joy in any of them: As in case a King shall abdicate his Kingdome, and manifestly relinquish his Power, then he turnes private man, and so may be dealt with as any other such. And some other the like.

Well, I have said enough of *Grotius* in the businesse, and should

should adde no more; but I remember I promised to shew that on occasion of these words of Christ to Saint *Peter*, he hath as much against the exposition pretended to be his and the whole doctrine of resistance, as the Kings friends could desire; and that is in his Annotations on the place, *Matt.* 26. 52. Ὅτι λαβόντες μαχαίραν, &c. *Neque vero ad* Petrum *tantum admonitio ista pertinet, sed ad Christianos omnes qui a publicis potestatibus ad pœnam expetuntur ob pietatis professionem.* The admonition belongs not to *Peter* onely, but to all Christians, when they are called by the Magistrate to suffer for the profession of piety; and sets the rule in that case, παρατιθέναι τὰς ψυχὰς τῷ κτίστῃ, to commit our soules to God, to expend our lives in his cause that gave us them; alleaging to this purpose what this *Peter* had learned from this master, 1 *Pet.* 4. 16, 19. and answering the common frivolous objection fetcht from the law of naturall defence or selfe-preservation, shewing the difference betweene the use of that liberty against theeves, &c. (against which the Lawes and Magistrates give us the liberty) and against the commands of the Supreme Magistrate; whom if in any case of injury, &c. private men may have permission to resist, or repell force with force, *omnia erunt tumultuum plena, nulla legum, nulla judiciorum authorum*: the perfect image of our Kingdome at this time when the words are Englished, as God knowes the sense is: and then he concludes with the case of Religion, wherein there is no place of resisting the higher powers, be their violence never so unjust. In Luk. p. 464.

I have undoubtedly made good my foure undertakings in this businesse: and shall beseech Master *Marshall* hereafter to write more cautiously, lest he provoke men to put him and the world in minde of other unjustifiable passages in his writings, to tell him of (that which in meere charity to him I desire he should know men doe take notice of) his dealing in a Sermon of his about *Josiahs* reformation preacht before the House of Commons long since: and of the applying of

the curse that fell on the Inhabitants of *Meroz*, *Jud.* 5. (for not helping their Soveraigne, namely *Deborah*, against a forraigne Enemy, *Jabin*) to those that will not joyne with himselfe against his Soveraigne and his Cavaleirs, i. e. those Forces raised by him. I wish heartily that Master *Marshall* having gotten so much authority, as to be the *Augustine*, the truly polemicall Divine of our times, would be so charitable to his disciples, as to imitate him, in retracting so many of his misadventures, as he cannot chuse but know to be such, and not to impose too intolerably on their credulity: or so tender of his owne reputation, as to acknowledge those himselfe, which every man that hath eyes doth discerne in his bookes, and would, were it not for meere pity, and the duty of loving enemies, give a large account of.

But I must remember, that Master *Marshall* adds two appearances of answer more to that allegation from Christ to Saint *Peter*; a word or two of those. Secondly, saith he, *supposing it was a reproofe of* Peters *using the sword, then the plaine meaning is to condemne* Peters *rashnesse who drew his sword and never staid to know his Masters minde whether he should strike or not, and so reproves those who rashly, unlawfully, or doubtingly use the sword.* But I pray Sir, are those the words of Christ, *They onely that take the sword without asking, or knowing my minde, shall perish, &c.* Or have we any reason to thinke that Christ would have then dispenced with a knowne law if he had answered him, and not rather have referred him to be regulated by it, as you see he doth, *for all that take, &c.*

2. To see the unluckynesse of it againe; the text *Luk.* 22. 49. saith expressely that they did aske him, said unto him, *Lord shall we smite with the sword?* so that the question was askt before he smote: and sure if it had beene Christs pleasure they should smite, one syllable would have exprest it and justified them; and that might have intervened before his striking: and that it did not intervene is no argument of the lawfulnesse of that striking in him, or the like in us: especially when so sharpe a reprehension immediately followes.

3. I

3. I shall grant the meaning is to condemne *Peters rashnesse* in doing a thing so unlawfull, without any commission; especially, when it was denyed by Christ upon asking: but not that the matter of the fact was perfectly justifiable if abstracted from that rashnesse: or that now Christs judgement being declared by his answer to him, it should be more justifiable in us, who have his example for our document.

4. I shall aske Master *Marshall* whether he hath asked and received knowledge of his Masters minde or no: he must not meane any of his great earthly Masters (that joyne with him in the warre against the Supreme: for sure if such tell us we may, or be so minded, that doth not prove that 'tis lawfull; for then I must aske them what Master they asked, and so, if they have none, conclude them in the number of the *rash* smiters) but Christ (for sure he was *Peters* master) or some taught by him in his word, who may give him assurance of the minde of Christ: and if this be produc'd we will be his disciples also. For, for his Supreme Master on earth, the meer-humane Christ, the Lords anoynted, I beleeve he meanes not that he should be asked, whether he may be, and should be resisted: and as little reason is there for us to be satisfied by being told by any others inferiour to him (especially by the chiefe resisters) that we may lawfully resist.

3. Master *Marshall* adds a consideration, that *now was the houre come of Christs suffering, and not of his Apostles fighting, wherein Christ would not be rescued, no not by twelve legions of Angels, much lesse then by the sword of man: therefore he saith to* Peter, put up, &c. *but intended not, that it should always be unlawfull for his people to use the sword in their just defence against unjust violence: for then he would never have commanded them but a little before, that he that hath two coates, let him sell one and buy a sword.* To this I answer, 1. That Christ might suffer, though *Peter* did resist: as we know he did, and consequently the houre of his suffering being come, could not make it in him a crime to resist, if otherwise it were not. It might make Christ refuse the helpe of his sword, but not produce the text proper to man-slayers against him, unlesse

lesse the fact in it selfe were of that nature. 2. This patient manner of Christs suffering and prohibiting resistance in his just defence, though it were then peculiar and by decree necessary to Christ; yet is it since become matter of example and necessary imitation to us, by force of that observation past upon it by Saint *Peter*, and entred into the Canon of our Scripture, 1 *Pet.* 2. 21. *Christ suffered for us, leaving us an example that we should follow his steps, &c.* And this used as an argument to enforce on us that duty, vers. 18. of being subject not onely to good and gentle, but also to froward masters. So that now thirdly, though that check had beene peculiar to Saint *Peters* act clothed with those circumstances, of being donewhen 'twas Christs houre of suffering; yet it will be obliging to us also, who are hereunto called, vers. 21. to suffer as patiently as Christ did. But then fourthly, we conclude not from any or all of this, that it should be alwayes unlawfull for Christians touse the sword in their just defence: nor indeed, that it was unlawfull then, Kings may and might subdue by the sword their rebellious Subjects: and private men might defend themselves from private invaders, and besides the proverbiall meaning of that speech (*of selling a coat and buying a sword*, whereby, say the fathers, he foretold them the dangers impendent over their heads, οὐκ ἵνα ὁπλίσωνται (ἄπαγε) *Chrys.* and advised them to provide for their owne security) I shall not doubt to acknowledge that this liberty of private defensive resistance is authorized by that same Scripture: But the resisting of the Magistrate by the Subject is the thing that from Christs words to *Peter* we undertake to shew unlawfull, and not any other resistance, and that the swords were appointed by Christ to be bought to that purpose, is not attempted to be proved by Master *Marshall*, and to suppose it without proofe, is to affirme, that no man could invade, or be fit to be killed but Magistrates. The truth is, here is some art used, either by Master *Marshall*, or some other artificer (interest, prejudice, or the like) By Master *Marshall* to deceive the Reader; or by that other to deceive the composer by using the phrase of just defence against

unjust

unjuſt violence (which every man grants lawfull among private men) and concluding that not to be made unlawfull by this text (which we doe not affirme) whereas all the diſpute is of reſiſting (not ſimply any man, but peculiarly) the Magiſtrate (and thoſe that come with authority from him) which we doe affirme to be the very thing exemplified and rebuked in this Text, and ſo ſtill ſtands (by that reprehenſion of Chriſt) forbidden to us, in deſpight of Mr. *Marſhall's* evaſions.

'Twill be now matter of wonder to any that all this paper ſhould be ſpent in defence of this one Argument ſo briefly confuted and diſpatcht by Maſter *Marſhall*; but I ſhall anſwer that wonder too; Firſt, that at the entring on this examination of thoſe few, the neceſſity of this length of words was not foreſeene; Secondly, that though the eſcaping the force of this place would not be matter of triumph to Maſter *Marſhall*, becauſe there be other places of the New Teſtament produced by his adverſaries, yet unanſwered; and one is enough to eſtabliſh a Chriſtian truth: yet the vindicating and clearing of this one from all exceptions, is the abſolute carrying the cauſe againſt him by that one: And therefore if this may be compaſſed, (which I am confident is by this diſcourſe) we may ſpare all further travell in this buſineſſe: and command the Subjects ſword taken out (though upon ſuppoſition of juſt defence, how unjuſtly ſoever that be pretended) againſt the lawfull Magiſtrate to returne to its ſheath againe. I wiſh to God it would obey the command.

Tu verò diſcipuli & amorem pium & humilitatem conſidera: alterum enim ex diligendi fervore; alterum ex obedientiâ fecerat. Nam cùm audiſſet, Mitte gladium tuum in vaginam, ſtatim obtemperavit, & nuſquam poſtea iſtud fecit. Titus Boſtr. *in* Matth.

Non ſe ſed magiſtrum eſt ultus, praterea nondum perfectæ & conſummatæ virtutis erat. Quod ſi vis Petri *ſapientiam intelligere, videbis poſteà cæſum & ſexcentas injurias paſſum, nullis malis, nullis calamitatibus perturbatum, ſed manſuetè omnia tolerantem.* Euthym. *in* Johan.

Ille utitur gladio, qui nullâ superiori ac legitimâ potestate vel jubente vel concedente, in sanguinem alicujus armatur. Nam utique dominus jusserat, ut ferrum discipuli ejus ferrent, sed non jusserat ut ferirent. Quod ergo incongruum, si Petrus *post hoc peccatum factus est pastor Ecclesiæ: sicut* Moyses *post percussum Ægyptium factus est rector istius Synagogæ? Uterque enim non detestabili immanitate, sed emendabili animositate justitiæ regulam excessit, uterque odio improbitatis aliena; sed ille fraterno, iste Dominico, licet adhuc carnali, tamen amore peccavit.* Aug. *l.* 22. *cont.* Faust. Man. *c.* 70.

FINIS.